SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
SANTA MARIA BRANCH; COOK STREET DIVISION
DEPARTMENT SM-2 HON. RODNEY S. MELVILLE, JUDGE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF)
CALIFORNIA,)
Plaintiff,)
-vs-) No. 1133603
MICHAEL JOE JACKSON,)
Defendant.)

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, MAY 2, 2005

8:30 A.M.

(PAGES 8305 THROUGH 8351)

REPORTED MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304
BY: Official Court Reporter

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

For Plaintiff: THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR.,
District Attorney -and-
RONALD J. ZONEN, Sr. Deputy District Attorney
-and- GORDON AUCHINCLOSS,
Sr. Deputy District Attorney -and-
MAG NICOLA, Sr. Deputy District Attorney
1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, California 93101

For Defendant: COLLINS, MESEREAU, REDDOCK & YU
BY: THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR., ESQ. -and-
SUSAN C. YU, ESQ. 1875 Century Park East, Suite 700
Los Angeles, California 90067
-and-
SANGER & SWYSEN BY: ROBERT M. SANGER, ESQ.
233 East Carrillo Street, Suite C Santa Barbara, California 93101

I N D E X

Note: Mr. Sneddon is listed as “SN” on index.
Mr. Zonen is listed as “Z” on index. Mr. Auchincloss is listed as “A” on index.
Mr. Nicola is listed as “N” on index. Mr. Mesereau is listed as “M” on index.
Ms. Yu is listed as “Y” on index. Mr. Sanger is listed as “SA” on index.

PLAINTIFF’S WITNESSES	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
WAGNER, Beverly	8311-A	8316-SA	8321-A	
BONNER, Craig (Re-called)	8322-N			

1 E X H I B I T S
2 FOR IN PLAINTIFF'S NO. DESCRIPTION I.D. EVID.
3
4 200-218 Turnberry Isle Resort & Club records 8309 8309
5 255-258 The Beverly Hilton records 8309 8310
6 418 Copy of check for
7 $1,000,000 8312
8 419 Copy of check for $500,000 8314
9 859 Visual chart documenting
10 phone calls 8325 8327
11 860-867 Linked phone calls record 8325 8328
12 871 Chart and spreadsheet for February 20, 2003 8325 8328
13 875-879 Charts for March 5, 2003,
14 to March 9, 2003 8325 8328
15 880 Linked phone calls and Excel spreadsheet 8325
16 881 Linked phone calls and
17 Excel spreadsheet 8325
18 882 Linked phone calls and Excel spreadsheet 8325
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 8308

Santa Maria, California
Monday, May 2, 2005
8:30 a.m.

THE COURT: Good morning, everyone.
THE JURY: (In unison) Good morning.
THE COURT: Call your next witness.
MR. SNEDDON: Good morning, Your Honor.
Before we get started this morning, we have some records that we want to move into evidence. I've discussed it with Mr. Sanger.
And the first set of records involves the documents that have been marked as Exhibits 200 through 218 for identification. We have the custodian of records certification from the Turnberry Inn, and we would move at this time that the documents 200 through 218 be admitted into evidence as business records and duly certified.
MR. SANGER: No objection.
THE COURT: They're admitted, 200 through 218.
MR. SNEDDON: In addition to that, Your Honor, we would be moving that the records that are No. 255 through 258, which again bear the custodian's certification from the Beverly Hilton Hotel, be admitted into evidence as Items 255 through 258.
MR. SANGER: No objection. 8309

THE COURT: They're admitted.
MR. SNEDDON: And then one other item of business, Your Honor, that we will complete at the break, but I wanted to bring to the Court's attention, we have some records that have been produced pursuant to a subpoena duces tecum from the Calabasas Inn & Country Suites, which are documents 219 through 222. And while there are copies in the Court's original, we want to be able to check the ones that came in to make sure they're exactly like the ones that are in the document, and we'll do that during the break.
And we'll be offering those later after Mr. Sanger and I have had a chance to review it, but I'd like just a stipulation that the clerk can provide that to us to examine during the course of the break.
THE COURT: Do you agree, Mr. Sanger?
MR. SANGER: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. That will be the order.
MR. SNEDDON: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Good morning, Your Honor.
The People call Beverly Wagner.
THE COURT: When you get to the witness stand, please remain standing.
Look over here. Face the clerk, raise your 8310

1 right hand.
2
3 BEVERLY WAGNER
4 Having been sworn, testified as follows:
5
6 THE WITNESS: Yes.
7 THE CLERK: Please be seated. State and
8 spell your name for the record.
9 THE WITNESS: Sure.
10 My name is Beverly Wagner. B-e-v-e-r-l-y.
11 W-a-g-n-e-r.
12 THE CLERK: Thank you.
13
14 DIRECT EXAMINATION
15 BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS:
16 Q. Good morning, Miss Wagner.
17 A. Good morning.
18 Q. Who do you work for, please?
19 A. U.S. Bank.
20 Q. What do you do for U.S. Bank?
21 BAILIFF CORTEZ: Your microphone, sir.
22 MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I'm sorry.
23 Q. What do you do for U.S. Bank?
24 A. I'm the bank manager at the bank.
25 Q. Which bank?
26 A. Right now I'm at the 4th and Wilshire
27 office.
28 Q. In the year 2003, did you work at a 8311

1 different branch?
2 A. Yes.
3 Q. What branch was that?
4 A. The 23rd and Santa Monica branch.
5 Q. And were you branch manager for that
6 particular branch?
7 A. Yes.
8 Q. That second branch, what is the city that
9 that's located in?
10 A. Santa Monica --
11 Q. Okay.
12 A. -- California.
13 Q. What is the branch that you worked at in
14 2003? Where was that? What city was that in?
15 A. 2221 Santa Monica Boulevard in Santa Monica.
16 Q. In Santa Monica, all right. Very good.
17 May I approach, Your Honor?
18 THE COURT: You may.
19 Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I'm going to show you
20 two exhibits, which appear to be copies of checks.
21 The first one has been marked as People's Exhibit
22 418, page three. It appears to be a check from
23 Neverland Valley Entertainment dated April 2nd,
24 2003.
25 Do you recognize that check?
26 A. Yes.
27 Q. How is it that you recognize that check?
28 A. From the name on the account and the routing 8312

number for U.S. Bank, and the account number.
Q. All right. Did you participate personally in the cashing of that check as branch manager for U.S. Bank?
A. Yes.
Q. And were you working at the Santa Monica branch at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you -- how is it that you personally participated in the cashing of that check?
A. This is way above the approval limit for a branch manager, and I had to get authority to even cash the check, so it had to come through my hands.
Q. How much is that check for?
A. One million dollars.
Q. And can you tell me in what manner that check was cashed? In other words, was it deposited? Was it -- did the bank disburse those funds in other methods? Tell me exactly how the individual cashed that check.
A. Cash.
Q. They walked in with this check and walked out with one million dollars in cash?
A. Yes.
Q. Did the bank have to make any special arrangements to put together that much money in cash?
A. Yes. 8313

Q. How much advance time is necessary for an individual to notify the bank that it will need to have certain funds on hand for a large cash disbursement like this?
MR. SANGER: Objection; relevance.
THE COURT: Overruled.
You may answer.
THE WITNESS: A minimum of about seven days.
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: All right.
THE COURT: What's the exhibit number, Counsel?
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: It's --
THE CLERK: 418.
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: -- 418, page three.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: All right. I now show you Exhibit 419, page three. Did you also participate in the cashing of that check?
A. Yes.
Q. That check is for how much?
A. $500,000.
Q. And did the same individual who cashed this first check cash that second check?
A. Yes.
Q. Was this check also cashed for currency?
A. Yes.
Q. So the individual walked in with this check and walked out with $500,000 in U.S. currency? 8314

A. Yes.
Q. The individual who cashed these two checks,
what is his name?
A. Fred Schaffel.
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: If I may ask Madam Clerk
to help me find a photograph.
If I can just have a moment, Your Honor.
Q. Miss Wagner, I show you People's Exhibit 16.
Do you recognize that individual?
A. Yes.
Q. Who is that?
A. Fred Schaffel.
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Thank you. I have no
further questions.
THE COURT: Cross-examine?
MR. SANGER: Thank you, Your Honor.
Do you want to take your book there? Are
the exhibits up there?
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Yeah.
MR. SANGER: Excuse me one second.
May I confer with counsel?
Do you have the official exhibit book there?
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Yes.
(Off-the-record discussion held at counsel
table.)
MR. SANGER: May I proceed, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: Thank you. 8315

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. SANGER:
Q. Miss Wagner, how are you?
A. I'm good, thank you.
Q. You were the branch manager at the 2nd and Santa Monica branch, is that what you said?
A. The 23rd and Santa Monica branch.
Q. 23rd. I can't read my handwriting. Sorry.
A. Okay.
Q. In any event, is that a branch where Frederic Marc Schaffel had one or more accounts?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. How many accounts did he have?
A. I believe it was three.
Q. Okay. And you produced records for his accounts, correct?
A. Pardon me?
Q. You produced records for his accounts to the Court?
A. Um -- what -- I'm not sure what records you're talking about.
Q. Okay.
A. Oh, yes. For -- yes, we did. U.S. Bank. Yeah. I'm sorry.
Q. Yes. I believe -- the District Attorney referred to you at one point as a custodian of records?
A. Yes. 8316

Q. Excuse me. So you were responsible for having records sent to the Court --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. -- at some earlier time?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And now you've identified two checks. And you're telling us on these two checks, Exhibits 418 and 419, page three in each one, that you personally participated in those transactions?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So you remember Mr. Schaffel coming in and getting cash for those two checks; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. All right. Now, you see my client, Mr. Jackson, sitting there, correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. Did Mr. Jackson come in the bank?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever seen Mr. Jackson before in person?
A. No.
Q. All right. Now, with regard to Mr. Schaffel and the records you produced, is it true that in his three accounts during, let's say, the first six months of 2003, that millions of dollars went through his accounts?
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: I'm going to object to reference to records that are not exhibits in this 8317

case as well as beyond the scope.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: Well, let's put it this way:
You -- as the branch manager and as the custodian of records, you reviewed the records before they were sent up here, right?
A. Not fully.
Q. Okay. Were you aware that Mr. Schaffel was a customer of the bank?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you knew that personally; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you knew it personally in part because you cashed these two checks for him, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have other dealings with him?
A. No.
Q. So the two times you really remember seeing Mr. Schaffel in person were with regard to these two checks; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. All right. A little hesitancy. You may have seen them --
A. More than twice, yes.
Q. But the two that stick out in your mind were these two, I take it?
A. Yes, sir. 8318

Q. I guess what I'm getting at is, to cash these checks, you had to make sure he really was a customer of your bank, right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. All right. And had he been a customer of your bank for a long time?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And during the course of his being a customer for your bank, did you conclude that he was trustworthy as far as dealing with him on these two rather large checks?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, the checks were drawn on an account that's called Neverland Valley Entertainment; is that correct?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And was it your understanding that Mr. Schaffel was the signatore on that account?
A. Yes.
Q. Was there anybody else who was a signatore on that account?
A. Yes.
Q. Who else?
A. Michael Jackson.
Q. Did Mr. Jackson ever sign any checks, to your knowledge, or sign any documents whatsoever on that account?
A. Yes. 8319

Q. Other than the signature cards?
A. I'm not sure.
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Objection; foundation.
THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. SANGER: All right.
Q. Did you review the records to determine whether or not Mr. Jackson ever signed anything other than the signature cards on that account?
A. No, sir.
Q. All right. And you did not verify Mr. Jackson's signature other than it was on the signature card; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. In other words, he didn't come in and sign in your presence?
A. No.
Q. You ended up looking in your records and you saw a signature card that appeared to have a signature for Michael Jackson; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And other than that, all of your dealings, as far as you know, were with Frederic Marc Schaffel, is that correct, on these accounts?
A. No.
Q. Were there other people that may have come in?
A. Not come in. But that I spoke with.
Q. Spoke with. Okay. All right. And you do 8320

not know what happened to this money after Mr. Schaffel walked out of the bank with it; is that correct?
A. No.
MR. SANGER: All right. And I have no further questions.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS:
Q. Were Michael Jackson and Frederic Marc Schaffel the only two authorized individuals as far as to remove funds from this account?
A. Yes.
Q. And you said you spoke to someone else other than Marc Schaffel about these accounts. Who was that?
A. I think at one time I spoke with Michael.
Q. Do you remember what that was about?
MR. SANGER: I'm going to object. That calls for hearsay. Calls for hearsay and there's a lack of foundation.
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Offered as an admission.
THE COURT: The objection is overruled. You may answer.
Q. BY MR. AUCHINCLOSS: Do you remember what that was about?
A. No. Not really.
Q. Did it have something to do with this 8321

account?
MR. SANGER: I'm going to object. That's leading and no foundation.
THE COURT: Overruled.
You may answer.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. AUCHINCLOSS: All right. Thank you very much.
MR. SANGER: No further questions.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You may step down.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: Call your next witness.
MR. NICOLA: The next witness will be Craig Bonner.
THE COURT: You may be seated. You're still under oath.

CRAIG BONNER
Having been previously sworn, resumed the stand and testified further as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. NICOLA:
Q. Good morning, Sergeant Bonner.
A. Good morning.
Q. With respect to your investigation in this case, did you have occasion to gather, sort and 8322

analyze telephone records and subscriber
information?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Do you see the stack of phone exhibits
sitting on counsel table? I believe they're 450
through 459.
A. Yes, I'm quite familiar with them.
Q. Do you recognize those exhibits?
A. I'm quite familiar, yes.
Q. And did you play a role in putting those
exhibits together and analyzing the information that
was contained within them?
A. I did.
Q. Can you briefly and generally explain to the
jury the process that was used to -- the initial
step used in getting a handle on the information
that's in those exhibits?
A. Yes. Basically we obtained quite a number
of telephone records through search warrant and
subpoena. We amassed those records and brought them
into a computer database, used that computer
database to compile and sort those records into a
format where we could begin to see patterns of calls
and who was calling whom.
We then utilized that information to cut out
the unnecessary material, or the material which we
could not substantiate through other evidence, and
we have brought that together now into exhibits that 8323

will show just those phone calls that are pertinent, and we have done that in a visual manner as well as in a document that will back up that visual manner.
Q. Okay. I think we missed a step. With respect to the information that was generated and you created a spreadsheet from it, can you explain to the jury how you verified the information that was in your spreadsheets?
A. The computer database basically put together a list of the calls that it said occurred between our involved parties to ensure that that list was correct. We then went into those records, which are the actual records sent by the phone companies, and we verified each and every call that the computer said occurred, and we have noted where that call occurs within those records.
Q. Okay. Did you prepare some exhibits for court today to demonstrate your testimony?
A. I did.
Q. As soon as I finish marking the last of these pages I'll show you the exhibit, okay? I apologize.
I'll ask you whether you reviewed the records from the Turnberry Resort - and I'll show you those documents in a minute - while you were conducting your phone analysis?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did you review records from The Beverly 8324

Hilton? And I'll also show you those exhibits in a minute.
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did you examine the record from Huntel with respect to air-ground communication for a flight occurring on February 7th of 2003?
A. Yes, I did.
(Off-the-record discussion held at counsel table.)
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Detective Bonner, with the Court's permission, I'd like to approach and show you Exhibits No. 859 through No. 882.
MR. SANGER: Excuse me. Let me just see what we have here.
(Off-the-record discussion held at counsel table.)
MR. SANGER: All right. Go ahead.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: I ask if you recognize Exhibit 859?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. What does 859 contain?
A. 859 is the visual chart documenting telephone calls between the involved parties on February 5th, 2003.
Q. Is there also a document behind the visual chart?
A. There is. It's an Excel spreadsheet, which is the verification of each call that is claimed on 8325

1 the visual chart.
2 Q. And did you create or cause to be created
3 these charts?
4 A. I did.
5 Q. And did you cause to be created 859 through
6 882?
7 A. I did.
8 Q. Okay. Now, with respect to testifying about
9 the contents of these exhibits, 859 through 882, did
10 you delegate some other of your colleagues to assist
11 you?
12 A. I did.
13 Q. And which exhibits will you be testifying to
14 today, if you could please the tell jury now?
15 A. I will testify to 859, 860, 861, 862, 863,
16 864, 865, 866, 867, 871, 875, 876, 877, 878 and 879.
17 Q. Okay. With respect to Exhibit Nos. 859
18 through 867, are those telephone charts and
19 spreadsheets between the period of February 5th of
20 2003 and February 16th of 2003?
21 A. That's correct.
22 Q. Exhibit 871, is that the chart and the
23 spreadsheet for February 20th of 2003?
24 A. That's correct.
25 Q. And with respect to Exhibits No. 875 through
26 879, do those cover the dates of March 5th, 2003,
27 through March 9th of 2003?
28 A. That's correct. 8326

Q. Turning your attention to Exhibit No. 859, would you briefly describe for us in general terms what is depicted on the chart?
A. This chart depicts a number of calls that occur between various individuals that have came up during this investigation, including Frank Cascio, Marc Schaffel, Jay Jackson, Evelyn Tavasci, as well as a number of telephones that come back registered to the Turnberry Resort in Florida.
Q. Okay. And do the numbers and links on that chart accurately reflect the information that you gleaned from the telephone records you've testified about previously?
A. That's correct.
Q. And does the information supporting the links you make on Chart 859 provided in the Excel spreadsheets an accurate depiction of what is on the charts?
A. That is correct.
MR. NICOLA: Your Honor, I would move 859 into evidence at this time.
MR. SANGER: I have a concern about foundation and relevance as to all of the entries, but I'll submit it at this point subject to cross-examination.
THE COURT: All right. I'll admit them.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: I'd ask you the same questions about Exhibits 860 through 867. Do each 8327

of those charts represent individuals that came up in your investigation, including the people you just mentioned, and link telephone calls between phones registered in their names?
A. That's correct.
Q. And do each of those exhibits also contain a spreadsheet supporting the information you placed on the flow chart?
A. That is correct.
MR. NICOLA: Your Honor, at this time we'd move 860 through 867 into evidence as well.
MR. SANGER: Same objection, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. They're admitted.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: I have the same question about Exhibit 871 and Exhibits 875 through 879. Do each of the charts in those exhibits accurately reflect the telephone calls between the phones listed on the charts that are connected to individuals in this investigation, and is there an Excel spreadsheet accompanying each chart supporting the information that's in the charts?
A. That's correct.
MR. NICOLA: We'd move 871 and 875 through 879 into evidence, Your Honor.
MR. SANGER: Same objection.
THE COURT: All right. They're admitted.
MR. NICOLA: Madam Clerk, may I have the Turnberry records that were just admitted, please? 8328

I believe they're 200. Thank you.
May I approach the witness, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Detective Bonner, I'm going to hand you a binder containing records from the Turnberry, Exhibits 200 through 218, and I'd ask if you'd review that.
And when you're finished, please tell us whether you recognize the contents and whether you used the contents in generating your charts and spreadsheets?
A. I recognize these charts as being the hotel records for the Turnberry Resort. And we utilized these charts in that they are the documents within our charts, in that they contain telephone records.
Q. Okay. Do you recognize the exhibits?
A. Yes.
MR. NICOLA: Your Honor, may I have "Input 4," please, and may I publish?
THE COURT: Yes.
(Off-the-record discussion held at counsel table.)
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Detective Bonner, I'm going to place on the Elmo what appears to be Exhibit 859; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Just starting in the upper left-hand corner, where there's a little telephone symbol and 8329

1 the name “Frank Cascio,” can you just give all of us
2 a very general description of what is intended to be
3 depicted in this exhibit?
4 A. Absolutely. What we have again are a number
5 of individuals whom we have determined through our
6 investigation to be involved or associated with Mr.
7 Jackson, including Mr. Cascio, Mr. Schaffel, Evelyn
8 Tavasci, Chris Carter, Debbie Rowe, and these are
9 the hotels -- the Turnberry Hotel records that we
10 have just spoke of, and these are calls between
11 these individuals.
12 Here we have telephones that belong to Frank
13 Cascio, telephones that belong to Mr. Schaffel, and
14 we have indicated that there are nine telephone
15 calls that occurred between telephones belonging to
16 Mr. Cascio and Mr. Schaffel, and each one of these
17 links tells the same information.
18 We have three calls that occurred between
19 telephones belonging to this, which is Evelyn
20 Tavasci’s home telephone number, and Frank Cascio’s
21 telephone numbers.
22 We have one call that occurred between Jay
23 Jackson’s telephone number and Evelyn Tavasci’s home
24 telephone number.
25 We have one call that occurred between the
26 Presidential Suite at the Turnberry, which was under
27 the name of Fred Macy, to Jay Jackson’s telephone
28 number. 8330

And again, each one of these links tells you that there is a call that occurred between phones belonging to this person and a phone over here, and the number of calls is indicated in the link.
Q. Okay. I'm going to put up the first page of the spreadsheet behind the chart for 2-5-03.
MR. SANGER: That's part of --
MR. NICOLA: That's a part of 859.
MR. SANGER: Part of 859.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: I'm only going to put up a portion of it, Detective, just so we're not publishing a bunch of home numbers.
Could you please describe what is intended by the numbers and the headings across this exhibit, please?
A. Okay. Starting over on the left, we have this number right here, (702) 234-9059. That is a telephone number that came back registered to Christopher Carter, which is indicated in the next one. And then we have the date of the call, which is 2-5-2003. We have the time of the call, which is at 2322 hours, 11:22 p.m. We have the duration of the call, one minute. We then have the number that he dialed, (201) 213-0763, which comes back registered to Frank Cascio. This is the source of that information that's detailed right here, which is -- came from T-Mobile records. This is the exhibit number which corresponds to one of those 8331

exhibits. This is the tab number within that exhibit. And this is the page number at which this record can be found within this exhibit.
Q. Okay. So the Chris Carter to Frank Cascio call occurring at 11:22 p.m. on February 5th, 2003, is found in the T-Mobile exhibit, which is 452, under the first tab, and under the page marked 11 of 23?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is that how all of the entries in all of these spreadsheets work?
A. Fundamentally. Different records have different means by which we were able to identify specific calls. Some of them actually had an exact call number to correspond to that call. And in that case we gave that exact call number to go along with it.
Q. Okay. Did you index the phone calls from the hotel records the same way?
A. Similarly, yes.
MR. NICOLA: If I may, Counsel, the second page.
MR. SANGER: Same exhibit?
MR. NICOLA: Same exhibit.
MR. SANGER: All right.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Would you turn to page two of your spreadsheet, and please go to the line with the heading "Macy Presidential"? 8332

THE COURT: What number exhibit is the spreadsheet?
MR. NICOLA: This exhibit is also Exhibit 859, Your Honor.
Q. Do you see on the bottom line up there?
A. I do.
Q. Is that the entry for the Presidential Suite at the Turnberry Isle Resort?
A. That's correct.
Q. I'm going to blow it up just a little bit so we can see portions of it. This doesn't want to focus.
Okay. How about we do it like this, Detective?
Okay. So the time of the call from the Turnberry Isle, from the Presidential Suite to Major Jackson, occurred at what time in the morning?
A. 0958 hours, or 9:58 a.m.
Q. And that's Florida time, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And when you indexed the hotel records, you referenced the exhibit, correct, 202 in this case?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then what does the T794, page six, mean in the last column?
A. T794 is a reference number that is on the documents pertaining to the Fred Macy Presidential Suite, and page six indicates that that particular 8333

telephone call is found on page six of the documents labeled T794.
Q. Okay. Would you turn to the Turnberry exhibit, please, 202, find the page where that phone call is and remove it for me, please.
MR. SANGER: What exhibit number?
MR. NICOLA: This is 202, page six.
Q. I'm going to put on the screen Exhibit 202, page six. And the call that you're referring to, is that the first entry for the date of 2-5 on this exhibit?
A. Yes. The first telephone call entry.
Q. Okay. And that appears to have lasted for 27 minutes?
A. Correct.
Q. And is that represented on your chart by the link between Fred Macy Presidential Suite and Jay Jackson?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. I'd like to flip this over to page five, if I may.
These appear to be phone entries for the date of February 4th, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. With respect to the bottom two telephones -- telephone entries ending in 6162, one at 1935 hours and one at 2054 hours, do you recognize those numbers from these exhibits? 8334

A. Yes, I do.
Q. And who do those belong to?
A. Those belong to David Ventura. That would be Janet Arvizo's parents.
Q. Okay. If we could go to the date of February 6th, please. Just have that ready. I'd like to finish discussing these records for the 5th.
Finishing up with Exhibit 859, Detective, with your pointer, please, and with respect to the call from -- the calls from Frank Cascio to Marc Schaffel, over what period of time did those occur?
A. I'll have to refer back to the spreadsheet.
Q. Please do.
A. Okay. The first call I have is in the early morning hours, specifically right before 1 a.m., and the last call I see is after 9 p.m.
Q. And did a number of these calls last for two minutes or more?
A. Yes.
Q. And did one of them last 15 minutes?
A. Yes. One call at 1:00, a little after 1 p.m.
Q. How many times did Mr. Cascio call the home of the defendant's personal assistant, Miss Tavasci?
A. Three times.
Q. And over what period of time did those calls occur? 8335

A. Again, the first call occurred -- I'm sorry.
The first call occurred at 3:42 p.m. The last call
occurred a little after 9 p.m.
Q. So those are within the times that Mr.
Cascio was ringing Mr. Schaffel?
A. That's correct.
Q. Or at least his phone was calling Mr.
Schaffel's phone?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. In the bottom left-hand corner,
there's a symbol that says, "Tavasci, Evelyn, MJJ
Prod, Unit 1." Can you explain that for the jury,
please?
A. That is a phone record. We took the naming
of that right off of the phone record, which is a
Nextel record.
Q. Is that a telephone number of (310)
864-7791?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And are all the calls either going to or
coming out of your flow chart for that telephone
number, the 7791 number?
A. I'm sorry, what was the question?
Q. Are all the numbers going to that Unit 1
number and going out to the same number, the 7791
number? Do you understand? You don't.
A. No.
Q. The calls from Chris Carter -- 8336

A. Okay.
Q. -- to the Unit 1 number, and the calls from Frank Cascio to the Unit 1 number, those are all to the same number, the 7791 number, correct?
A. Correct, the one for -- that's indicated as Unit 1.
Q. Okay. And there are other Tavasci, Evelyn, MJJ Production phones later on that have different telephone numbers, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. That's why I was asking about this one. The calls in between Chris Carter and the Turnberry Resort and Marc Schaffel going to the link in the bottom right, the Turnberry Isle Resort, are those incoming or outgoing calls; do you know?
A. Those are both outgoing from the individual, i.e., Marc Schaffel or Chris Carter, going to the Turnberry Resort.
Q. Okay. And the Andy Brandon room in the middle, is that the only room where both the Cascio phones and the Schaffel phones were connected during this period of time?
A. On that date, that's correct.
Q. Can you tell us the period of time in which the calls between Schaffel and the Brandon room occurred, please?
A. Okay. With regard to Andy Brandon room to Marc Schaffel, I have the first call at about 10:40 8337

1 in the morning, and ending at right after 10 p.m.
2 Q. All day long?
3 A. All day long.
4 Q. With respect to the call between Major
5 Jackson and Evelyn Tavasci's home, can you tell us
6 whether Mr. Jackson called Miss Tavasci or whether
7 it was the other way around?
8 MR. SANGER: Well, I'm going to object.
9 We're referring to an individual making a call as
10 opposed to somebody at one phone calling somebody at
11 another phone.
12 THE COURT: Sustained.
13 Q. BY MR. NICOLA: With respect to the phone
14 call between the Evvy Tavasci phone and the Jay
15 Jackson phone, can you tell us which way that call
16 went?
17 A. Okay. That was Evelyn Tavasci's telephone
18 calling Jay Jackson's telephone.
19 Q. And how long did that -- how long was that
20 call?
21 A. Three minutes.
22 Q. And was that after the call between the Fred
23 Macy Presidential Suite and the Jay Jackson phone?
24 A. That appears to be prior to.
25 Q. In Pacific time or Eastern time, Sergeant
26 Bonner?
27 A. That would have been Pacific time.
28 Q. So it's listed as 7:27 Pacific time? 8338

A. It actually -- yeah, 7:27 a.m. Pacific, which would be after, I'm sorry.
Q. Okay. So the call from the Presidential Suite came first, and then the call from the Tavasci home came second?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. If you could please turn to Exhibit 860. I'm going to put this chart up. And briefly if you could summarize this chart for the jury, using your laser.
A. Okay. As with the previous date, we're again showing the connections of telephone calls between telephones belonging to various individuals identified throughout this investigation. Again, we have Frank Cascio, Marc Schaffel, Evelyn Tavasci, Christopher Carter, Hamid Moslehi, David Ventura, that's Janet Arvizo's parents, Jay Jackson, Deborah Rowe, and again, telephones at the Turnberry Resort.
Q. Can you tell us, please, when the first call between the Cascio phone and the Schaffel phone occurred?
A. The first call that I have between the Cascio phone and the Schaffel phone occurs slightly before 1 a.m. at 0039 hours.
Q. And your chart indicates there were 19 calls between the two phones?
A. That's correct.
Q. And did those last essentially throughout 8339

the day?
A. Yes. The last call occurred a few minutes before midnight at 2351 hours.
Q. With respect to the calls between the Cascio phone and the rooms named “Stressler” and “Franklin” at the Turnberry, starting with the Stressler room, can you tell us whether that was incoming or outgoing?
A. It’s an outgoing call from the Stressler room to Frank Cascio’s telephone.
Q. What about the Franklin room?
A. Again, that would be an outgoing call from the Franklin room to the Cascio telephone.
Q. And the calls between the Brandon room and the Schaffel phone?
A. That is an outgoing call from the Brandon room to Schaffel’s telephone.
Q. Do you have a time for the phone call between the Schaffel phone and the Deborah Rowe phone?
A. 2116 hours.
Q. Which direction was that call going?
A. That was from Deborah Rowe to Marc Schaffel’s telephone.
Q. Okay. From Ms. Rowe’s phone to Mr. Schaffel’s phone?
A. That’s correct.
Q. You show two calls between the Schaffel 8340

phone and phones registered to David LeGrand?
A. Correct.
Q. And can you tell us when the first phone call was?
A. The first phone call was at 1:48 p.m.
Q. And how long did that last?
A. Five minutes.
Q. And the second phone call?
A. Was at 2:30 p.m., again for five minutes.
Q. Okay. With respect to the calls from the Gavin Franklin room to Janet's parents and the Jay Jackson phone, it's a little blurry from here. Can you tell us how many calls there were from the Franklin room just to Janet's parents?
A. There were eight calls.
Q. Were there two rooms registered under Gavin?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And in your Excel spreadsheet, did you separate the rooms out?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Do you know how many calls came from either room, and if you could give us the room designation?
A. There are two room designations. One would be T597, the other would be T309. With regard to T597, I have six of those calls to the Venturas' residence coming from T597, and I have two of the calls coming from T309.
Q. Is Room T597 Exhibit 216 in the Turnberry 8341

book?
A. That's correct.
Q. Would you please remove the page that contains the phone calls you're referring to?
Sergeant Bonner, I'm going to put page one of Exhibit 216 on the board and I'll blow that up.
Okay. The calls, at least two of the calls, between Room T597 registered under Gavin Franklin, are those right in the middle of the exhibit?
A. Yes, right here.
Q. Okay. And the first call lasted four minutes and the second one four minutes?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And those are the first phone calls for the 6th, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Showing you page two of the same exhibit, the last call to the 6162 number on the 6th is 11:53 p.m., top line?
A. Yes. All this is -- this one appears to be at straight-up midnight, so depending on which day you want to count that one to.
Q. I count midnight as tomorrow.
A. Either one.
Q. That will work, okay. And then the bottom three numbers, those are Jay Jackson?
A. Correct.
Q. And they're dated 2-6, but clearly they 8342

occur after midnight, right?
A. Correct.
Q. So did you put those on the charts for 2-7?
A. I would have put these on 2-7, that's correct.
Q. Can you tell us, please, at what time the Cascio phone and the phone registered to Mr. Jackson's personal assistant, Miss Tavasci, what time those occurred?
A. The first call occurred at 5:34 p.m.; the second call at 8:17 p.m.
Q. And shortly after getting -- shortly after the phone call between Cascio and Tavasci, after the first one, were there two calls immediately to Mr. Schaffel, 1750 and 1757?
MR. SANGER: I'm going to object, again.
MR. NICOLA: To the Schaffel phone, excuse me.
MR. SANGER: No foundation.
MR. NICOLA: I'll rephrase.
THE COURT: Is that the same objection as using the phone instead of the person?
MR. SANGER: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: All right. Sustained.
MR. SANGER: There are actually several numbers as well.
MR. NICOLA: Okay.
Q. Between -- let me start this over. 8343

After the phone calls between the Cascio phone and the Tavasci phone, were there two phone calls immediately following -- to the Schaffel phone from the Cascio phone?
A. There were two calls, one to one number associated with Schaffel and another to another number associated with Schaffel. The first one at 1750. The second one at 1757 hours, or 5:50 and 5:57 p.m.
Q. Okay. So the 5:57 one lasted for seven minutes?
A. That's correct.
Q. If we could turn to Exhibit 861, those are phone calls occurring on the 7th of February, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Again, you've mapped calls from the Turnberry out to other individuals?
A. Correct.
Q. There is a "Fred Macy, regular room," kind of in the middle of this exhibit. Can you explain to us what you mean by that?
A. There were two different rooms that were registered to Fred Macy. One was the Presidential Suite that cost several thousand dollars a night. There was also a Fred Macy room that was a room that cost about $400 a night, which is what all of the other rooms cost. These are two separate records, 8344

and to designate that, we had “Fred Macy Presidential” and “Fred Macy regular room.”
Q. Okay. And the calls from the -- the rooms, the individual rooms at the Turnberry and the phone registered to Mr. Christopher Carter, were all those outgoing calls?
A. No. They are, with the exception of this call right here, where there’s one call. That is an incoming call from Carter’s -- or a telephone associated with Carter to the Turnberry Isle Resort.
Q. Okay. But the individual rooms are all outgoing calls, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. You can’t see incoming calls on the individual room bills; isn’t that right?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And the Turnberry Isle Resort number, that’s the main line?
A. Yes.
Q. The calls from Schaffel -- the Schaffel phone, excuse me, to the Turnberry Isle Resort, are all those going from Schaffel to the Turnberry Isle?
A. This specific connection right here, these are calls from Schaffel to the Turnberry. However, these two are not.
Q. Okay. And the call from the Chris Franklin room to Neverland Valley Ranch, can you tell us whether that occurred before or after the outgoing 8345

call to the Chris Carter phone? You can look at your records.
A. Let me just clarify that. You want to know whether or not this call here occurred before or after that call there?
Q. No. There are two calls coming out of the Chris Franklin room, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. One to the Neverland Valley Ranch?
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. And the other one to the Chris Carter phone?
A. Correct.
Q. Which one occurred first, please?
A. Okay.
The first call occurred to the Neverland Valley Ranch at 9:06 a.m.
Q. What time was the second call?
A. It occurred at 803 p.m.
Q. I placed in front of you Exhibit No. 850. Do you recognize that document?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. What is that?
A. This is a billing record for air-to-ground telephone calls that occurred on an Xtra Jet flight on February 7th, 2003.
Q. And does it appear that calls were made from that flight to the phone registered to Janet's 8346

parents?
A. Yes, there were three calls.
Q. And did those occur in time after the ten calls from the Gavin Franklin rooms to the phone at Janet's parents?
A. The telephone calls on the airplane occurred after the telephone calls from the Gavin Franklin room.
Q. Okay. Do those -- did they occur -- did the phone calls from the aircraft occur after the phone calls from the Gavin Franklin rooms to the Jay Jackson phone?
A. They occurred after.
Q. And were there also phone calls placed from that aircraft to numbers registered to Neverland Valley Ranch?
A. Yes, there were.
Q. Two of them?
A. Yes.
Q. And how long did those calls last?
A. I have one for one minute. And one for two minutes.
Q. And the three calls that were placed from the aircraft to the phone at Janet's parents' house, were they interspersed with the calls to the Neverland phone or did one group come before the other?
A. They were interspersed. 8347

Q. Sergeant Bonner, if you could turn to Exhibit No. 862, please, and the supporting chart.
MR. SANGER: That's 2-8?
MR. NICOLA: 2-8.
Q. Do you have this? If you could please describe each one of the phones and monikers you've given them on this exhibit, please, 2-8. Exhibit 862 for February 8th of 2003.
A. Okay. Starting in the top left, we have a cellular telephone that came back -- the records said -- indicated MJJ Productions, Miko Brando. We then had another phone that came back to Evelyn Tavasci, MJJ Productions, Unit 1. This one came back to just MJJ Productions, Evelyn Tavasci, without a unit number. This was a telephone registered to Christopher Carter. These were telephone lines that came back to Neverland Valley Ranch. These are telephone lines that came back to Marc Schaffel. Telephones associated with Debbie Rowe. Telephones associated with Frank Cascio. Telephones associated with Vincent Amen. Telephones associated with Christian Robinson, under the business name Site LLC. And a telephone associated with Rudy Provencio.
Q. With respect to the contacts between the Cascio phone and the Vince Amen phones, if you could find those in your records, please.
A. Okay. I have those. 8348

Q. Could you tell us what time the first call between those two phones occurred?
A. The first time is 11:13 a.m.
Q. And that was a call for three minutes?
A. Correct.
Q. Which direction did it go?
A. From Amen to Cascio.
Q. And the second phone call?
A. Occurred at 2:47 p.m., again, from Amen to Cascio.
Q. And that was a one-minute call, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. With respect to the call between the Cascio phone and the Neverland Valley Ranch number, would you tell us what time that occurred?
A. The first call occurred at five -- correction, 11:48 a.m.
Q. The call between the Chris Carter phone and the Neverland Valley Ranch phone, can you tell us what time that occurred, please?
A. At four -- or, correction, 2:44 in the morning.
Q. Was there a call between the Cascio phone and the phones at Neverland Ranch at around that same time?
A. That's correct. There was a call at 2:34 a.m. from Neverland Ranch to Cascio.
Q. And that showed as an incoming call on Mr. 8349

Cascio's phone record, correct?
A. That's correct.
THE COURT: All right. We'll take our break.
(Recess taken.)
--o0o--

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE)
OF CALIFORNIA,)
Plaintiff,)
-vs-) No. 1133603
MICHAEL JOE JACKSON,)
Defendant.)

I, MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304, Official Court Reporter, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing pages 8309 through 8350 contain a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the within and above-entitled matter as by me taken down in shorthand writing at said proceedings on May 2, 2005, and thereafter reduced to typewriting by computer-aided transcription under my direction.

DATED: Santa Maria, California, May 2, 2005.

MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA
SANTA MARIA BRANCH; COOK STREET DIVISION
DEPARTMENT SM-2 HON. RODNEY S. MELVILLE, JUDGE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF)
CALIFORNIA,)
Plaintiff,)
-vs-) No. 1133603
MICHAEL JOE JACKSON,)
Defendant.)

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

MONDAY, MAY 2, 2005

8:30 A.M.

(PAGES 8352 THROUGH 8472)

REPORTED MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304
BY: Official Court Reporter 8352

APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

For Plaintiff: THOMAS W. SNEDDON, JR.,
District Attorney -and-
RONALD J. ZONEN, Sr. Deputy District Attorney
-and- GORDON AUCHINCLOSS,
Sr. Deputy District Attorney -and-
MAG NICOLA, Sr. Deputy District Attorney
1112 Santa Barbara Street Santa Barbara, California 93101

For Defendant: COLLINS, MESEREAU, REDDOCK & YU
BY: THOMAS A. MESEREAU, JR., ESQ. -and-
SUSAN C. YU, ESQ. 1875 Century Park East, Suite 700
Los Angeles, California 90067
-and-
SANGER & SWYSEN BY: ROBERT M. SANGER, ESQ.
233 East Carrillo Street, Suite C Santa Barbara, California 93101

I N D E X

Note: Mr. Sneddon is listed as “SN” on index.
Mr. Zonen is listed as “Z” on index. Mr. Auchincloss is listed as “A” on index.
Mr. Nicola is listed as “N” on index. Mr. Mesereau is listed as “M” on index.
Ms. Yu is listed as “Y” on index. Mr. Sanger is listed as “SA” on index.

PLAINTIFF’S WITNESSES	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
BONNER, Craig (Re-called)	8393-SA	8446-N	8450-SA	
ZELIS, Paul (Re-called)	8451-N	8467-SA		

E X H I B I T S

FOR	IN	PLAINTIFF'S NO.	DESCRIPTION	I.D.	EVID.
		868	Linked phone calls and Excel spreadsheet	8452	8452
		869	Linked phone calls and Excel spreadsheet	8453	8453
		870	Linked phone calls and Excel spreadsheet	8453	8453
		880	Linked phone calls and Excel spreadsheet	8325	8454
		881	Linked phone calls and Excel spreadsheet	8325	8454
		882	Linked phone calls and Excel spreadsheet	8325	8454
		883	Correction to People's Exhibit No. 879	8447	8448

DEFENDANT'S NO.				
5011	Hand-drawn diagram re phone calls	8402	8404	
5012	Hand-drawn diagram re phone calls	8419	8419	
5013	Hand-drawn diagram re phone calls	8427	8427	

1
2 THE COURT: Go ahead.
3 MR. NICOLA: Thank you, Your Honor.
4 Q. Sergeant Bonner, with respect to the call
5 between --
6 BAILIFF CORTEZ: Microphone, sir.
7 MR. NICOLA: Thank you.
8 Q. Sergeant Bonner, with respect to the call
9 between the Cascio phone and the Neverland Valley
10 Ranch phones occurring at 1544, or 3:44 in the
11 afternoon, was that a four-minute call?
12 A. That was a four-minute call.
13 Q. Okay. And were there also calls between the
14 Cascio phone and the Neverland Ranch phone that
15 occurred from between 35 and 45 seconds, in addition
16 to that one?
17 A. I see two other calls.
18 Q. Okay. And did they last for that period of
19 time, between 35 and 45 seconds?
20 A. Correction, I'm sorry. There's three other
21 calls. Yes, 35 seconds and 45 seconds.
22 Q. If you could turn to the next exhibit in
23 order, please, Exhibit 863.
24 MR. SANGER: Which is what, 2-12?
25 MR. NICOLA: 2-12.
26 Q. Is that 2-12, Detective?
27 A. That's correct.
28 Q. Now, to your knowledge, was February 12th 8356

the day the Arvizos left Neverland Ranch the first time?
A. I believe it is about that time frame, yes.
Q. And beginning at the upper left-hand corner, please, can you indoctrinate the jury as to the individual names you have up there by those phones?
MR. SANGER: I'm not sure "indoctrinate" was the correct word, so I object.
THE COURT: All you do is quibble.
(Laughter.)
THE COURT: Is that an objection?
MR. SANGER: It's an objection.
THE COURT: All right. Sustained.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Could you explain, please?
A. Absolutely. The first phone we have is a telephone number that is registered to the Law Firm of Geragos & Geragos. We then have a telephone that is registered to Ann Kite, a telephone that is registered to Azia Pryor. And the telephone number that is registered to David Ventura, Janet Arvizo's parents. Again, we have telephones that are registered to Frank Cascio and telephones that are registered to Marc Schaffel. We also have a telephone registered to Christopher Carter, Neverland Valley Ranch, and a couple of telephones associated with Evelyn Tavasci's residence. One is the primary, another is a secondary line. We then have a telephone registered to Hamid Moslehi. 8357

Again, one registered to Christian Robinson under the business name Site LLC. A telephone associated with Vincent Amen. And a telephone associated with David LeGrand.
Q. Beginning right in the middle of the chart -- maybe it will show clearer if I blow that up. Well, that wasn't the right button.
Is that a "38" between the phones of Mr. Cascio and Mr. Schaffel?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. When did the first of the 38 phone calls between the two phones occur?
A. The first call that I have is at 0024 hours, or shortly after midnight.
Q. And how long did that call last?
A. One minute in length.
Q. Was there another call from the Cascio phone to the Schaffel phone immediately thereafter?
A. Yes, there was.
Q. And at what time?
A. 0025 hours. Four minutes.
Q. How long did that last?
A. Four minutes.
Q. Was there another one immediately after that?
A. We then jumped to 0037 hours for one minute.
Q. Next?
A. 0039 for nine minutes. 8358

Q. Was that one outgoing or incoming to the Cascio phone?
A. The last two were actually incoming calls.
Q. Okay. What about the next call?
A. That's an incoming call at 0047 hours.
Q. How long did that last?
A. For seven minutes.
Q. And the next call?
A. Again, an incoming call at 0054 hours for two minutes.
Q. And that's going from the Schaffel phone to the Cascio phone, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Is there another call from Schaffel phone to Cascio phone?
A. Yeah, at 0056. I have a two-minute incoming call from the Schaffel phone to the Cascio phone.
Q. Was there another call after that?
A. 0058 hours. Again, an incoming call from the Schaffel phone to the Cascio phone for five minutes.
Q. Can you tell us when the next call between a Schaffel phone and a Cascio phone occurred?
A. We then skip to 10:52 a.m.
Q. And which direction is that call going?
A. That is, again, an incoming call from a Schaffel phone to a Cascio phone for six minutes.
Q. Immediately after the incoming call from 8359

Schaffel phone to Cascio phone, was there a call placed from the Vinnie Amen phone to a Marc Schaffel phone? Take a look at 11:01.
A. That's correct, I have a call at 1101 hours for two minutes, and this is a direct call from Vincent Amen to Marc Schaffel.
Q. You mean their phones, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And at 11:02 p.m., was there a one-minute call between Frank Cascio's phone and Vince Amen's phone?
A. That's correct. For one minute. Again, this one would be Cascio calling Amen.
Q. And immediately after that, at 11:03, was there a call from the Cascio phone to the Chris Carter phone?
A. That's correct. One minute. It's an outgoing from Cascio to Carter's phone.
Q. Was there a phone call between the Cascio phone and the Vince Amen phone at 11:06?
A. That's correct. It's an outgoing call from Frank Cascio's phone to Vincent Amen's phone for four minutes in length.
Q. And at the same time was there an incoming call from the Marc Schaffel phone to Frank Cascio's phone, again at 11:06?
A. That's correct. I have a three-minute incoming call on Cascio's phone from a phone 8360

registered to Marc Schaffel.
Q. When was the next call between Vince Amen --
Vince Amen's phone, excuse me, and Frank Cascio's
phone?
A. At 1113 hours for one minute.
Q. And that was from a Cascio phone to an Amen
phone?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Was there a call placed between Marc
Schaffel phone and the phone belonging to Ann Kite?
A. Yes, there was.
Q. Do you also know her as Ann Gabriel?
A. Yes.
Q. What time was that phone call and how long
did it last, please?
A. The first call was at 11:40 a.m. for 11
minutes in length.
Q. If you could find the record for Frank
Cascio/Marc Schaffel at 12:41.
A. Okay. I have that.
Q. You've got it? Okay. The call between
Frank Cascio's phone and Marc Schaffel's phone at
12:41, how long did that last?
A. Three minutes.
Q. Okay. And then at 1312, 1:12 in the
afternoon, was there a call placed between a phone
belonging to Frank Cascio and Chris Carter? Chris
Carter's phone, excuse me. 8361

A. That's correct, a one-minute call.
Q. And immediately after that, was there a seven-minute call placed by the Frank Cascio phone to Neverland Valley Ranch?
A. Correct, at 1313 hours for seven minutes.
Q. After that phone call, was there a call placed from the Frank Cascio phone to the firm Geragos & Geragos?
A. Correct. At 1333 hours.
Q. And after the phone call to Geragos & Geragos, was there a call between Frank Cascio's phone and the home of defendant Jackson's personal assistant, Evelyn Tavasci?
A. Correct, at 1343 hours.
Q. How long was that call?
A. One minute in length.
Q. Was there another call placed exactly one minute after that?
A. Correct. At 1344 for three minutes.
Q. To the home of Evelyn Tavasci?
A. Correct.
Q. After that three-minute phone call, was there a call between the Frank Cascio phone and the Marc Schaffel phone?
A. Which call were you interested in?
Q. 1348 hours.
A. That's correct, for two minutes 11 seconds.
Q. So the call at 1344 to the home of Evelyn 8362

1 Tavasci from the Cascio phone lasted three minutes,
2 and then the next call from the Cascio phone was to
3 the Schaffel phone at 1338, which lasted for two
4 minutes, correct?
5 A. Correct.
6 Q. With respect to the link between the Evelyn
7 Tavasci home number and the phone registered to
8 Mr. Moslehi, did that occur at 2:11 in the
9 afternoon, 1411?
10 A. Correct. 2:11 for one minute.
11 Q. Were there additional phone calls between
12 the Frank Cascio phone and the Geragos & Geragos
13 phone? Specifically at 1527 and 1542 in the
14 afternoon.
15 A. That's correct. The first at 1527 was a
16 55-second incoming call. The second at 1542 was a
17 five-minute 54-second call.
18 Q. And in between those two calls to the
19 Geragos phones from the Cascio phone, was there a
20 call by the Cascio phone to the Marc Schaffel phone
21 at 1540?
22 A. That's correct. I have a one-minute call
23 between the Cascio phone and the Schaffel phone.
24 Q. Was there a call placed from a Schaffel
25 phone to the phone of David LeGrand at 1547 hours?
26 A. That's correct. Three minutes in length.
27 Q. And at 1727 hours, is that the next phone
28 call between the Cascio phones and the Schaffel 8363

phones?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did that last for seven minutes?
A. Yes, that was seven minutes in length.
Q. And shortly after that phone call at 1742,
was there an incoming call from the second home line
of Mr. Jackson's personal assistant to the phone
registered to Frank Cascio?
A. That is correct. For one minute and ten
seconds.
Q. Are there additional phone calls between Ann
Kite -- between the Ann Kite phone and the Marc
Schaffel phone in the evening, approximately 8:24?
A. 6:24 p.m.
Q. Okay. How long did that call last?
A. Four minutes in length.
Q. Now, with respect to the 19 calls between
the Cascio phone and the Amen phone, and the 38
calls between the Cascio phone and the Schaffel
phone, did one group of phone calls occur before,
after, or interspersed with the others?
A. They were interspersed.
Q. Throughout the entire day?
A. Correct.
Q. If you could turn your attention to the
phone call between the Christian Robinson phone and
the Moslehi phone. If you could find that.
A. I have it. 8364

Q. Which direction was that phone call in?
A. Christian Robinson contacting Hamid Moslehi's phone.
Q. Okay. With respect to the phone calls in the upper right-hand corner between Janet's parents' phone and the phone registered to Azia Pryor, was there a call placed at approximately eight o'clock at night, 2000 hours?
A. Correct. At 8:06 p.m. for a little over one minute.
Q. One minute, or one hour 33 minutes?
A. I'm sorry. One hour 33 minutes.
Q. Okay. Do you know which direction that call went?
A. That call was from the Venturas' residence to Azia Pryor's phone.
Q. Okay. If you could turn your attention to Exhibit -- 863 or 864, which one's next?
A. 864.
MR. SANGER: What's that, 2-13?
MR. NICOLA: That's 2-13, Counsel.
Q. Without trying to indoctrinate, could you explain for the jury what's on that?
A. Again, we have telephone numbers that are associated with the various individuals. I believe all of these we've already spoke of. Hamid Moslehi, Christian Robinson, Vincent Amen, Evelyn Tavasci, David Ventura, Janet's parents, Frank Cascio, 8365

Neverland Valley Ranch, Azia Pryor, Marc Schaffel, Ann Kite, the law offices of Geragos & Geragos, and Deborah Rowe Jackson.
MR. MESEREAU: Excuse me.
MR. NICOLA: Bless you.
MR. MESEREAU: Thank you.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: If we could go to the bottom right-hand corner specifically with respect to the phone calls between the Ann Kite phone and the Geragos & Geragos phone, how many were there? Because we can't quite see it.
A. Four.
Q. And in which direction?
A. All four calls were from Ann Kite to the law offices of Geragos & Geragos.
Q. Is that five calls between the Ann Kite phone and the Schaffel phone?
A. That's correct.
Q. With respect to the four calls between the Ann Kite phone and the Geragos & Geragos phone, what was the shortest call?
A. One minute in length.
Q. And there were two of those?
A. Correct.
Q. Was there also a six-minute call and a two-minute call respectively?
A. Correct. At 10:05 and 3:48 p.m.
Q. Okay. So at 10:05 a.m., there is a 8366

1 one-minute call between the Ann Kite phone and the
2 Geragos & Geragos phone, correct?
3 A. Correct.
4 Q. Also at 10:05 a.m. is another one-minute
5 call between the Ann Kite phone and the Geragos &
6 Geragos phone?
7 A. That's correct.
8 Q. And also at 10:05 a.m., there's a six-minute
9 call between the Ann Kite phone and the Geragos &
10 Geragos phone?
11 A. Correct.
12 Q. Okay. And the last call between the Ann
13 Kite phone and the Geragos & Geragos phone?
14 A. Was at 3:48 p.m. for two minutes.
15 Q. Okay. And in between the time interval that
16 you've just testified about, how many times did Ms.
17 Kite's phone contact the Schaffel phones?
18 A. Two times.
19 Q. Is one of those times at 10:11 in the
20 morning?
21 A. Correct.
22 Q. That was immediately after the 10:05 call to
23 the Geragos & Geragos firm?
24 A. Correct.
25 Q. How long did that 10:11 call to the Schaffel
26 phone last?
27 A. 11 minutes. Correction. 17 minutes.
28 Q. Was there another call at 11:30 to the 8367

1 Schaffel phone?
2 A. That's correct. For 13 minutes.
3 Q. Okay. Was there a call at 7:06 a.m. between
4 the Ann Kite phone and the Marc Schaffel phone?
5 A. Correct. One minute in length.
6 Q. And immediately after that call, was there a
7 call between the Schaffel phone and Neverland Valley
8 Ranch?
9 A. There was also a call at 7:06 from Schaffel
10 to Neverland Valley Ranch for 17 minutes in length.
11 Q. After the call to Neverland Valley Ranch,
12 was there a call between the Marc Schaffel phone
13 going from the Marc Schaffel phone to the Ann Kite
14 phone?
15 A. Correct. At 0759 for 15 minutes.
16 Q. Do your records show a phone call between
17 the Frank Cascio phone and the David Ventura
18 phones -- phone?
19 A. That's correct. I have outgoing calls from
20 the Ventura to the Cascio phone.
21 Q. And what time are those two calls?
22 A. Two calls. The first one at 11:35 p.m. for
23 four minutes. Second one at 11:43 p.m. for three
24 minutes.
25 Q. Immediately preceding those two outgoing
26 calls from the Ventura phones to the Cascio phones,
27 were there a number of phone calls from the Ventura
28 line to the Azia Pryor line? 8368

A. I have three calls from the Ventura line to the Azia Pryor line. The first one at 5:47 p.m. for nine minutes. The second one at 6:37 p.m. for 14 minutes. And the last one at 7:21 p.m. for two minutes.
Q. If you could turn your attention to the calls surrounding Frank Cascio's phone. With respect to the one call going between the Frank Cascio phone and the Evelyn Tavasci phone, what time did that occur, please?
A. That occurred at 5:37 p.m., four minutes in length.
Q. With respect to the 12 calls between the Amen phone and the Cascio phone, can you tell us generally what time of day those 12 calls occurred?
A. With the exception of one call, they occurred in the afternoon to evening time frame.
Q. And was that first call the exception, at 054 in the morning?
A. Correct.
Q. And how long did that last?
A. Four minutes.
Q. And which direction was that going?
A. Frank Cascio calling Vincent Amen.
Q. Immediately prior to that was a one-minute call between the Frank Cascio phone and the Marc Schaffel phone at 052 in the morning?
A. That's correct. One minute in length. 8369

Q. Sergeant Bonner, if you could turn to Exhibit 865, please. Could you please explain the chart for February 14th of 2003, Exibit 865.
A. Again, as with the other ones, we have a number of telephone numbers that are associated with individuals that have came out during this investigation. And we start with Vincent Amen, Hamid Moslehi, David LeGrand, Frank Cascio, Marc Schaffel, Christian Robinson, Ann Kite, the Law Offices of Geragos & Geragos, Evelyn Tavasci, David Ventura, and Azia Pryor.
Q. If you could begin in the center with the Moslehi, Schaffel and Christian Robinson phones, can you tell us first which direction the call from -- in between Moslehi and Schaffel occurred, between their phones?
A. The Marc Schaffel phone contacted the Hamid Moslehi phone for one minute in length at 8:42 p.m.
Q. What about the contact between the Christian Robinson phone and the Marc Schaffel phone?
A. That was a call from the Christian Robinson phone to the Marc Schaffel phone, one minute in length, at 10:18 p.m.
Q. And in between the call from the Schaffel phone to the Moslehi phone, and the Christian Robinson phone and the Schaffel phone, were there two calls placed to Frank Cascio, one from the Ventura phone at 2105 hours? 8370

A. I have a phone call from the David Ventura residence to a Frank Cascio phone at 2105 hours, two minutes in length.
Q. And at 2130 hours, 9:30 p.m., was there a call between the Vince Amen phone and a Frank Cascio phone?
A. That's correct. 2130 hours, one minute in length.
Q. It's not clear on the chart, from here anyway, but how many times was there contact between the Cascio phone and the Ventura phone, Janet's parents?
A. There were four calls.
Q. Can you tell us what time the first call was made on Valentine's Day 2003?
A. The first call I have is from the Ventura residence to a Cascio phone at 4:45 p.m., one minute in length.
Q. Okay. When was the next call, please?
A. The next call occurred at 7:29 p.m. This one was from the Cascio phone to the Venturas' residence, two minutes in length.
Q. And the next one, please?
A. Was at 7:45 p.m., again from the Cascio phone to the Ventura residence, for 59 seconds.
Q. Is the next one the call that occurs at 2105, 9:05 p.m., between the Ventura residence and the Cascio phone? 8371

A. That's correct. Two minutes in length.
Q. Okay. Are there also a number of calls between the Ventura phone and the Azia Pryor phone?
A. Yes, there are.
Q. And are they going in one direction or both directions, generally?
A. They're going in both directions.
Q. And what time is the first call between those two phones, please?
MR. SANGER: Your Honor, I'm going to object at this point. I've been waiting, but it does seem that this is cumulative, and the relevance in these details -- I'll object on relevance.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: The first call occurred at 2:20 p.m., one minute in length, from the Ventura residence to the Azia Pryor telephone.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Do you have an entry there marked 1250 in the morning?
A. I'm sorry, that's correct. That's the first one. 1250, one minute 30 seconds in length, from Azia Pryor's phone to the Ventura residence.
Q. One minute 30 seconds?
A. I'm sorry, one hour 30 minutes. They're numbers.
Q. You bill like phone companies, in reverse. And when was the last call between the Ventura phones and the Azia Pryor phones for the 8372

14th?
A. The last call I have is at 11:40 p.m. for two minutes in length from the Ventura phone to the Azia Pryor phone.
Q. Okay. And in total, there was contact between the LeGrand phone and the Kite phone just one time?
A. Correct.
Q. And two times between the Kite phone and the Geragos & Geragos phones that day?
A. Correct.
Q. If you could please continue to Exhibit 866, the chart for February 15th. And please explain this exhibit for the jury, please.
A. It's a little off center.
Q. Okay.
A. Okay. Again, we have a number of individuals who we have identified as being associated with this investigation, and these are telephones that are associated with those individuals: Hamid Moslehi, Rudy Provencio, Vincent Amen, Marc Schaffel, Frank Cascio, Neverland Valley Ranch, Ann Kite, Law Offices of Geragos & Geragos, Evelyn Tavasci, Jay Jackson, a second line into Evelyn Tavasci's residence, David Ventura and Azia Pryor.
Q. Was the first call between the Cascio phone and the Jay Jackson phone at 2:11 in the morning? 8373

1 Look on page two, four up from the bottom.
2 A. The David Ventura phone.
3 Q. Oh, I'm sorry. Was that the first of five
4 calls to the David Ventura phone at 2:11 in the
5 morning?
6 A. Correct.
7 Q. And can you tell us when the first call was
8 between the Cascio phone and the Jackson phone that
9 morning, that day?
10 A. The first call I show is at 10:17 a.m. from
11 the Jay Jackson phone to the Cascio phone.
12 Q. Of the 14 calls between the Jay Jackson
13 phone and the Frank Cascio phone, how many of them
14 lasted more than one minute?
15 A. 11 of them.
16 Q. Was there a call between the Frank Cascio
17 phone and the Geragos & Geragos phone that day as
18 well?
19 A. Yes, there was.
20 Q. And what time was that?
21 A. That occurred at 2:45 p.m., for 44 seconds,
22 from Cascio to Geragos phones.
23 Q. And prior to that phone contact between the
24 Cascio phone and the Geragos & Geragos phone, was
25 there a 15-minute phone call beginning at 1424 hours
26 between the Cascio phone and the Jay Jackson phone?
27 A. That's correct.
28 Q. And immediately after the phone call between 8374

1 the Cascio phone to the Geragos & Geragos phone,
2 were there two more calls placed between the Cascio
3 phone and the Jackson phone?
4 A. Correct. At 1501 and 1502, first one for
5 one minute and the second one for three minutes.
6 Q. And at the end of the three-minute call at
7 1502 between the Cascio phone and the Jackson phone,
8 was there a call between Frank Cascio's phone and
9 Marc Schaffel's phone?
10 A. That's correct, at 1505 hours for three
11 minutes.
12 Q. Of the three calls between the Cascio phone
13 and the Tavasci home phone, can you tell us what
14 time the first call was?
15 A. The first call occurred at 5:45 p.m., six
16 minutes in length.
17 Q. And which direction was that call going?
18 A. That was from Cascio to the Tavasci phone.
19 Q. At that same time, at 5:45 p.m., was there a
20 call from the Vince Amen phone to the same Frank
21 Cascio phone that dialed the Evvy Tavasci home
22 phone?
23 A. That's correct. It was seven minutes in
24 length from Amen to Cascio.
25 Q. And at the same time, the Cascio phone
26 called the Tavasci home?
27 A. Correct.
28 Q. And that was for six minutes? 8375

A. Correct.
Q. Is that what's known as a three-way call,
Sergeant?
A. It is potentially a three-way call.
Q. Immediately after that call between the
Amen/Cascio, Cascio/Tavasci phones, was there a call
placed from the Cascio phone to the Schaffel phone?
A. That's correct. I have a two-minute call at
1755 hours from the Cascio phone to a Schaffel
phone.
Q. Okay. And then were there two calls after
that between the Cascio phone and one of the Evelyn
Tavasci home phone numbers and the Cascio phone and
the other Tavasci home number, the second line, at
1825 and 1843 hours?
A. That's correct. I have the first call at
1825 hours for three minutes and 33 -- correction,
three minutes and 36 seconds, and that is from the
Cascio phone to the Tavasci, Evelyn, home phone.
And the second call is at 1843 hours, one
minute 47 seconds in length, and that goes from the
Cascio to the Evelyn Tavasci second home line.
Q. At 1851 hours, was there a phone call
between the Cascio phone and the Jay Jackson phone?
A. That's correct. Two minutes in length.
Q. This would be the call immediately after the
call from Cascio's line to the second home line at
Evvy Tavasci's? 8376

A. A few minutes later, correct.
Q. Okay. And that was a two-minute call?
A. Correct.
Q. At the end of that phone call at 1853 was there another call placed from the Cascio line to the same Jay Jackson line?
A. That's correct. We have a call at 1853, for 17 minutes in length.
Q. And at the end of that call, at 1910 hours, was there another call placed from the Frank Cascio phone to the Jay Jackson phone?
A. Correct. Three minutes 19 seconds in length.
Q. And immediately after that call, was there -- excuse me. Were there two calls placed from the Frank Cascio phone to the Frank Schaffel phone?
A. Okay. Yes, we have one at 7:14 p.m., one minute in length. And another one at 7:16 p.m., four minutes in length.
Q. After the phone call at 7:16 p.m. between the Cascio phone and the Schaffel phone, did the phone belonging to Jay Jackson connect with a phone belonging to Frank Cascio, in that direction?
A. That's correct. At 8:43 p.m. for four minutes 15 seconds.
Q. Was there another call between the same two phones and in the same direction at 8:48 p.m. that lasted for two minutes? 8377

A. Correct.
Q. And immediately after that phone call at 8:48, was there a call between the Frank Cascio phone and the Evvy Tavasci home phone?
A. That's correct, at 8:56 p.m., two minutes 28 seconds in length.
Q. Was there a call approximately ten minutes later from the Cascio phone to the Amen phone at 2108?
A. Correct. Six minutes in length.
Q. At the end of that six-minute call, was there a call between the Cascio phone and the Neverland Valley Ranch phone?
A. That's correct. 2126 hours. That's an incoming call from Neverland Valley to the Cascio phone, three minutes 41 seconds in length.
Q. If you could turn to Exhibit 867, please. And is that the chart for Sunday, February 16th, of 2003?
A. That's correct.
Q. If you could explain to the jury what's depicted in this exhibit, please.
A. Once more, we have a number of telephones that are associated with individuals that have came up during this investigation; namely, starting on the left, Chris Tucker, Vincent Amen, Rudy Provencio, Evelyn Tavasci, Azia Pryor, Neverland Valley Ranch, Marc Schaffel, Chris Carter, David 8378

Ventura, Jay Jackson, Frank Cascio, another call from Marc Schaffel, and Christian Robinson as Site LLC.
Q. With respect to the calls between the Cascio phone and the Jay Jackson phone, the chart shows a "2" over a "1." Were there 21 calls between the two, or what?
A. No, there was not. That should indicate that there were two calls from one direction and one call from the other direction.
Q. Which direction were the two calls from?
A. From Jay Jackson to Frank Cascio. And one call from Frank Cascio to Jay Jackson.
Q. Okay. Can you tell us the time of the first call between Jay Jackson and the Frank Cascio phone?
A. The first call occurred at 4:32 p.m., four minutes in length, from Jay Jackson to Frank Cascio telephones.
Q. And when was the last call between the two phones?
A. At 11:26 p.m., two minutes 30 seconds in length, from the Frank Cascio phone to Jay Jackson phone.
Q. In between the first and last calls between the Jay Jackson phone and the Cascio phone, was there contact between the Cascio phone and the Neverland Valley Ranch phone?
A. The only call I'm showing was at 0100 hours. 8379

Q. So there was not?
A. Correct.
Q. When was the first call between the Vince Amen phone and the Frank Cascio phone?
A. 0844 hours, or 8:44 a.m.
Q. If you could turn to Exhibit 871, I believe. Is that the chart for February 20th?
A. That's correct.
Q. Is it Detective Zelis who will have all the fun with the charts on the 17th, 18th and 19th?
A. That's correct.
Q. I placed Exhibit 871, or a reasonable likeness, up on the board. Do you know whether this date, February 20th, coincided with the filming of a rebuttal video?
A. That is my understanding, correct.
Q. Okay. And explain to the jury, please, what's depicted in this exhibit.
A. Again, we have icons which are associated with telephones registered to individuals that have came up during this investigation. Starting at the top left, we have Frank Cascio, Marc Schaffel, David Ventura, Jay Jackson, Evelyn Tavasci second line, Evelyn Tavasci's home line, Neverland Valley Ranch, Vincent Amen, the Turnberry Isle Resort, Christopher Carter and Rudy Provencio.
Q. If you could begin, please, with the phone calls between the Vincent Amen line and the Jay 8380

1 Jackson line, tell us what time the first call was
2 placed.
3 A. The first call occurred at 10:02 a.m., two
4 minutes in length, from Amen to Jackson.
5 Q. Would you look at the time stamp, 9:51 on
6 your chart, please?
7 A. I'm sorry, they're out of order. 9:51 would
8 be the first call.
9 Q. And the second call would be at 10:02 a.m.?
10 A. Correct.
11 Q. How many times did the Vince Amen phone
12 contact the Marc Schaffel phone that day?
13 A. I have five calls.
14 Q. And was the first call placed at nearly one
15 o'clock in the morning or just before one o'clock in
16 the morning?
17 A. Five minutes prior, at 0055 hours.
18 Q. And how many times was there contact between
19 the Vince Amen phone and the Frank Cascio phone that
20 day? You could refer to the chart itself if it
21 helps you.
22 A. I'm just double-checking. I have 31 calls.
23 Q. Was the first call a call that was placed
24 between Frank Cascio's phone and Vince Amen's phone
25 at 1:25 in the morning?
26 A. That's correct.
27 Q. And how many times was there contact between
28 the Cascio phone and the Schaffel phone on the 8381

morning -- on the day of the 20th?
A. I have 11 calls. And I have two -- two more, so a total of 13.
Q. Of the two calls between the Cascio phone and the Evvy Tavasci home phone, can you tell us whether they were going in one direction or both ways?
A. It appears they were going just from Cascio to Evelyn Tavasci.
Q. From the Cascio phone to the Tavasci phone?
A. Correct.
Q. And what time is the first call from the Cascio phone to the Tavasci phone?
A. At 1:26 p.m., three minutes in length.
Q. If you would please turn to the next exhibit that you have, which is No. 875 -- actually, before we leave 871, the chart shows seven calls between Neverland Valley Ranch and Frank Cascio's number; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And what time did those calls begin and in which direction were they going, please?
A. I believe each of these calls was an incoming call. I'm sorry, they're going both directions. And they start at a little after 2 p.m. and end a little after 9 p.m.
Q. Okay. Now you can turn to Exhibit 875, please. 8382

MR. SANGER: Is that March 5?
MR. NICOLA: It's March 2.
THE WITNESS: March 5th.
MR. SANGER: March 5 is what mine says.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Is there an exhibit tag on March 2nd?
A. Yeah. It's not mine, though.
Q. Okay. I'm sorry. 875 is March 5th. And who's doing March 2nd, 3rd and 4th?
A. Chief Investigator Dave Saunders.
Q. I'm sorry. Is this a chart for Wednesday, March 5th?
A. It is.
Q. Okay. Explain to the jury what's on this exhibit, please.
A. Okay. Again, we have a number of icons that are associated with telephones that are registered to individuals that have came up during this investigation. Starting on the left, we have Frank Cascio, Neverland Valley Ranch, Evelyn Tavasci/MJJ Productions, another number, MJJ Productions/Miko Brando, Evelyn Tavasci home, Rudy Provencio, Paul Hugo and David LeGrand.
Q. Let's talk about the Frank Cascio phone and the Neverland Valley Ranch phone. Can you tell us when they first -- when they first begin and which direction they went?
A. They first started at shortly before 2 a.m. 8383

in the morning, which was an incoming call from Neverland to Frank Cascio, and it ended at 6:15 p.m., again with an incoming call from Neverland to Frank Cascio. In between that we had two calls from Cascio to Neverland.
Q. Okay. Can you tell us what time the call between the Paul Hugo phone and the Rudy Provencio phone was?
A. Okay. That was at 2109 hours for one minute in length.
Q. And also between the Paul Hugo phone and the David LeGrand phone, please?
A. That was 2134 hours, or 9:34 p.m., for two minutes in length.
Q. Okay. If you could move to Exhibit No. 876, please. And if you could explain to the jury what's on this exhibit?
A. Okay. As with the other exhibits, we have a number of telephones associated with individuals and/or locations that have came up during this investigation. I'll start on the left. We have Paul Hugo, Marc Schaffel and Vincent Amen. We have Frank Cascio, Neverland Valley Ranch. This was a room at the Beverly Hilton that was registered under Christopher Carter. We have the MJJ Productions/Miko Brando phone, Evelyn Tavasci/MJJ Productions phone, Evelyn Tavasci second home line, and the Evelyn Tavasci home line. 8384

Q. Could you turn to the exhibit book on your right, please, and find Exhibit No. 255? Are those The Beverly Hilton records?
A. These are.
Q. Okay. Exhibit 255, is that the room bill for Chris Carter, Room 429, from The Beverly Hilton?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. Did the phone charge -- do the phone charges on The Beverly Hilton records include minutes?
A. I don't immediately recognize anything as being specific to length of call.
Q. And indeed, there are no minutes on your chart for The Beverly Hilton calls, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you show three calls going from The Beverly Hilton out of the Chris Carter room on the 6th to Ms. Evelyn Tavasci's home or second home numbers?
A. That's correct.
Q. And what time is the first call?
A. I have two calls that occur at 1136 hours. One to the home line; the second one to the second home line.
Q. Okay. Can you remove the page you're looking at in Exhibit 255?
MR. SANGER: Which one?
MR. NICOLA: March 5. 8385

Q. Showing you page one of Exhibit 255, just generally the time stamp in the middle column on the left, for example, eleven-three -- 11:36, that's the time that corresponds to the call in your charts, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And there's nothing on the right that indicates the length of the time; isn't that right?
A. I don't recognize anything as being a length.
Q. Can you tell us at approximately what time the call between the -- between the Hugo phone and the Schaffel phone was, please?
A. 15 -- or 3:59 p.m.
Q. How long did that call last?
A. Two minutes in length.
Q. And can you tell us what time the calls between the Amen phone and the Schaffel phone were?
A. At 12:21 p.m. and 12:17 p.m., four minutes and three minutes respectively.
Q. And your records show the only place of relevance to your investigation that the Cascio phone called was the Neverland Valley Ranch line?
A. That's correct.
Q. If you could move on to Exhibit 877, please. And is 877 the chart for Friday, the 7th of March, 2003?
A. That's correct. 8386

Q. Again, the only calls from Frank Cascio that you registered were to Neverland Valley Ranch?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can you tell us what time the first call was and what time the last one was?
A. The first call occurred five minutes after midnight, at 0005 hours, and the last call occurred at 12:03 p.m.
Q. Sergeant Bonner, can you tell us about the middle icon, The Beverly Hilton Kenneth Morgan room?
A. As with the Chris Carter room on the previous day, this was a room at The Beverly Hilton which was registered under the name Kenneth Morgan.
Q. And in which exhibit did you find the Kenneth Morgan phone records from The Beverly Hilton?
A. It was under Exhibit 256.
Q. Would you find those in the exhibit book, please?
A. Done.
Q. Done. When was the first call made from that room and to what number?
A. The first call occurred on 3-7, 2003, at 9:21 p.m. to the Evelyn Tavasci home line.
Q. How many calls were placed to the Evelyn Tavasci home line from the Kenneth Morgan room?
A. On the 7th?
Q. Yes, please. 8387

A. I have a total of four calls.
Q. And when was the last phone call between the Kenneth Morgan room and the Evvy Tavasci home?
A. At 9:51 p.m.
Q. Is there a room charge visible on Exhibit 256?
A. There is; in the amount of $850.
Q. Per night?
A. Correct.
Q. I believe the next exhibit is 878.
MR. SANGER: Your Honor, I'm going to move to strike the last answer for the purpose of objecting to the question. I didn't know where he was going, but it's not going anywhere and violates the Court's rule -- ruling, the room charge.
THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. SANGER: Stricken?
THE COURT: Stricken.
MR. NICOLA: Stricken?
THE COURT: Yes.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Exhibit 878, is that March 8th? I haven't put it up yet.
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. What do you have listed in Exhibit 878?
A. Again, we have icons representing telephones associated with individuals and/or locations that have came up during this investigation; namely, 8388

starting on the left, Neverland Valley Ranch, Evelyn Tavasci/MJJ Productions, MJJ Productions/Miko Brando, Beverly Hilton, again the Kenneth Morgan room, Evelyn Tavasci/MJJ Productions, and Evelyn Tavasci, home.

Q. Are the phone calls between the Evvy Tavasci home and the Kenneth Morgan room also contained in Exhibit 256?

A. Yes, they are.

Q. And of the 12 calls you have listed, can you tell us which direction they were going?

A. All of those are outgoing calls.

Q. And over what --

A. From the Kenneth Morgan room to the Evelyn Tavasci room, or line.

Q. And over what period of time did those 12 phone calls span?

A. The first call I have occurs at 8:35 a.m. in the morning and the last call occurs at 6:57 p.m. in the evening.

Q. Were there calls from the Kenneth Morgan room to two other phones registered to Evvy Tavasci through MJJ Productions?

A. There were.

Q. And on the right-hand side of that exhibit appears to be the number “3” in the middle of a link. Can you tell us about that phone number, please, between the Kenneth Morgan room and the 8389

Evelyn Tavasci MJJ Production phone?
A. Okay. That is the -- the phone number is (818) 402-7087. It comes back registered to Evelyn Tavasci, MJJ Productions.
Q. And in the top center of the page, there's another telephone with the same icon. Is that a different number with the four connections?
A. Actually, I'm sorry, that -- the four is the 7087 number. The four calls were to that (818) 402-7087. And the three calls were to (310) 717-8984.
Q. The next exhibit in order, please, Exhibit 879. Is this the exhibit for Sunday, March the 9th?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Can you tell us what time the phone call between the Cascio phone and the Evvy Tavasci second home line was?
A. It occurred at 11:34 p.m., and that was an incoming call from Tavasci to the Cascio line.
Q. Can you tell us about the phone calls between the Cascio phone and the Schaffel phone on that day?
A. I have two telephone calls from the Cascio phone to -- correction, one from the Cascio phone to the Schaffel phone. Another one that was an incoming from Schaffel to Cascio. First one was one minute prior to 7 p.m., and the second one was at 9:31 p.m. 8390

Q. Can you tell us about the 12 phone calls between the Evvy Tavasci/MJJ Production phone and the Schaffel phone, please? Do you know when the first one occurred?
A. No. There appears to be an error.
Q. That should say “Neverland Valley Ranch”?
A. It should.
Q. Okay. Can you tell us what time the first call to Neverland Valley Ranch occurred?
MR. SANGER: I’m just going to object for the moment, that there is a reference to, “That should be Neverland Valley Ranch,” and it’s not clear what that reference is to.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: The 12 phone calls I was referring to should have been referred to as the Neverland Valley Ranch, correct?
A. That’s correct.
Q. So the link between the Tavasci/MJJ Productions phone and the Marc Schaffel phone is incorrect; is that what you’re saying?
A. That’s correct.
Q. Okay. Were there any calls between the Schaffel phone and the Tavasci phone for that day?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So the 12 calls between the Tavasci/MJJ Production phone and the Neverland Valley Ranch phone began at what time that day? 8391

A. 8:48 a.m.
Q. And what time did they cease?
A. At 8:19 p.m.
Q. Is the chart -- excuse me, is the spreadsheet behind the chart accurate, to your recollection?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. And is that how you realized the actual chart that's up on the screen is incorrect with respect to the link between the Evvy Tavasci phone and the Marc Schaffel phone?
A. That's correct.
Q. The call between the Amen phone and the Schaffel phone, what time did that occur, please?
A. At 1757 hours.
Q. And that was a one-minute call?
A. One-minute duration.
MR. NICOLA: Your Honor, I'll move to strike this chart, Exhibit 879.
It is 879, correct?
THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. NICOLA: Pending correction.
MR. SANGER: Well, I object to that. It's been referred to in front of the jury, so it should remain. And they can present a corrected chart if they want.
MR. NICOLA: We can do that.
THE COURT: I think that's the way to do it. 8392

Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Did that take you through your daily obligation?
A. It did.
MR. NICOLA: Thank you.
Your Honor, I have no further questions at this time.
THE COURT: All right. We'll take our break and then you can do your cross.
(Recess taken.)
THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Sanger, you ready?
MR. SANGER: Yes.
Before we do, I was right in the middle of trying to find Exhibits 451 and 458. They're in a binder.
MR. NICOLA: The originals? They're all right here.
MR. SANGER: There we go. All right. I'll get to them in a minute.
May I proceed, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. SANGER:
Q. Okay. Some big-picture questions. First of all -- I don't really want to go through the exact times of minutes of everything, but there are some big-picture questions.
First of all, in all these phone records 8393

that you analyzed, were you able to determine from
the phone records whether or not Michael Jackson was
ever on a single call?
A. No.
Q. And as to some of the other records, for
instance, those pertaining to Marc Schaffel,
Frederic Marc Schaffel, there are several telephone
numbers associated with Mr. Schaffel, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And you're one of the lead detectives in
this case, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Based on your investigation, during the
period of time February and March of 2003, Mr.
Schaffel had converted his house into an office; is
that right?
A. It's the first I've heard of it, but --
Q. Were you aware that he had a number of
people working out of his house?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And they had different offices
set up in his house?
A. The interviews that I've conducted,
basically people were working -- doing work out of
his house, but not necessarily separate offices.
Q. Okay. All right. Now, I notice on the
summary charts, sometimes, in fact most of the time,
you included one-minute calls? 8394

A. Correct.
Q. Sometimes you did not, correct?
A. Usually -- I mean, we tried to include everything that was a one-minute call.
Q. Okay. For instance - and I'll find the chart here - but there was a chart, I believe, where you had not shown two calls from Jay Jackson's house because apparently they were very short calls. They were one-minute calls.
MR. NICOLA: Objection. The question is vague.
THE COURT: Overruled.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: Do you recall that?
A. I think I can clarify that. The records that were introduced into evidence show that those calls were actually less than 30 seconds in length, and that's why we removed those calls from the overall count.
Q. All right. So some of these phone records -- you looked at phone records from various carriers and from hotels; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And some of the carriers bill a call as a minute, no matter how long it takes?
A. Correct.
Q. If it's under a minute, I should say, of course.
A. Yes. 8395

Q. And sometimes the carrier will show a specific number of seconds; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. Now, another big-picture item, if we can. There are some calls that you showed were placed to the law firm of Geragos & Geragos?
A. That's correct.
Q. And some of those calls -- and we can go through if you want, but some of those calls were a minute or less, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Do you have any reason to believe that the caller was able to get through the receptionist and to an attorney there?
A. I wouldn't necessarily think an incoming call less than a minute, but an out -- I'm sorry, an incoming call from Geragos to the cell phone could result in a connection in less than a minute. However, I would highly doubt that a call from the cell phone to Geragos would probably result in a call.
Q. In other words, his law firm has a receptionist; is that correct?
A. I would assume so.
Q. Okay. And there are a number of people that work at his law firm besides Mr. Geragos himself?
A. That's correct.
Q. All right. Another overall question. When 8396

there are phone calls that are placed to -- they're coming into a place like the Turnberry or one of the other hotels, those calls go to a switchboard; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then the switchboard would send the calls to particular rooms or particular staff people or guests or whatever, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And so, number one, you have no way of determining where those calls ended up, correct?
A. Other than to say they went to the Turnberry itself, no.
Q. That's right. As far as you could trace it, it got to the reception desk, and then where it went from there we don't know?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And once again, if there's a one-minute call to one of those hotels, there's no reason to believe that the call actually got completed to a guest in the hotel?
A. Not necessarily, no.
Q. Okay. All right. One more overall question here. You mentioned Rudy Provencio in your analysis, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the first call that you show Rudy Provencio was involved in was on February the 8th of 8397

2003; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And there are some other references to Mr. Provencio from time to time being involved in phone calls after that date, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. But you have no phone calls showing that Rudy Provencio was involved in making or receiving calls from any of the people involved in this investigation before February the 8th, 2003, correct?
A. Not that has made it into these exhibits.
Q. Well, based on your analysis of the records and everybody else that was helping you - right? --
A. Correct.
Q. -- you have no indication that Rudy Provencio talked to anybody on the phone associated with this case before February the 8th, 2003; is that correct?
A. Again, I'd have to -- to say that it's based within these exhibits, no, there is not. However, I am aware that there are some records that did not make it into the computer to get analyzed with this, and I can't tell you whether or not there are or are not calls in those records.
Q. Okay. So you're saying -- you're leaving the door open that, you know, there's some other records, but you did your best job at analyzing what 8398

you thought was important for this case, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. And you tried to put in all the phone calls that you thought would be important to the investigation, right?
A. Correct.
MR. SANGER: Okay. Now, let me ask if I can retrieve from the District Attorney, I think I need the original of 451 and 458.
MR. NICOLA: Help yourself.
MR. SANGER: May I walk around here?
THE COURT: Yes.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: Now, Detective Bonner, did you prepare these charts, these actual charts that you have shown?
A. I had them prepared, correct.
Q. Okay. And some of these were finalized just this morning or late last night; is that correct?
A. Late last night.
Q. Okay. So we were handed the final versions of some of them just this morning. They were handed to the defense this morning, correct?
A. I don't know when you were handed. I do know that we finalized them late last night.
Q. All right. Did you do a chart for February the 4th, 2003?
A. No.
Q. Were you aware that there were telephone 8399

calls relating to some of the people in this case on February the 4th, 2003?
A. Yes.
Q. And specifically let me ask you if those were from the SBC Pac-Bell phone records, or, I don't know anymore, AT&T phone records?
A. I'd have to refer to the records.
Q. Okay. I'm sorry, just one second.
Okay. Let me get you the original.
All right. May I approach the witness, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: I'm going to show you Exhibit 451 and I've turned it to Tab No. 6, and see if you're oriented as to what that is.
A. Okay. This is a telephone record, a Pacific Bell telephone record for the Jay Jackson line, (213) 739-9279, and it shows two calls on February 4th to a phone number ending in 1861.
MR. SANGER: And, Your Honor, with your permission, may I put a copy of that one page up?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: All right. This is 451, Tab 6.
Q. All right. And that -- the two calls that I'm referring to there say, "FE04." Is that February 4th? Is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. 6:11 p.m. and 6:14 p.m.; is that correct? 8400

A. Correct.
Q. It says -- oh, thank you. There's a point up there, I think we all know but -- all right. And it says, "Reseda." Is that where it's going or where it came from?
A. I believe that's where it's going to.
Q. And that's the phone number that it's going to, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And this is the phone number that it's coming from; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. And both of those phone calls were four minutes apiece?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. The phone that this was coming from was Jay Jackson's phone; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. The phone number it's going to is whose phone?
A. I don't immediately recognize that number.
Q. All right. Let's see if we can figure it out here.
If you turn to Tab 9, please, and look at those documents and see if those are the types of documents that would assist you in determining who is assigned a particular phone number.
A. It is. That phone number, (818) 757-1861, 8401

comes back to Chris Tucker.
Q. Chris Tucker. Okay.
What I'm going to propose, with the Court's permission, is I'm going to write on a piece of paper here illustrative of the witness's testimony. I'll take it piece by piece, and if he agrees, I'm going ask to admit it and publish it.
So I'm going to start with a blank piece of paper, and I guess we should have that marked as defense next in order, if we may.
THE COURT: That's fine.
MR. SANGER: Thank you.
THE CLERK: That's 5011.
MR. SANGER: 5011? Okay. Why don't we go ahead and mark that piece of paper.
Okay. Thank you.
Q. Okay. Now, you would agree that the phone records that we just referred to up here, which is from Tab No. 6 of Exhibit 451 - okay? - the one that's on the board - all right? - you would agree that those relate to February 4th of 2003; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So I'm going to write at the top "02-04-03."
Now, your chart started -- Exhibit 859 started on 02-05-03; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. That was a Wednesday. So what day of the 8402

1 week would 04 be?
2 A. Tuesday.
3 Q. There you go. You paid attention in grammar
4 school and it paid off, all right.
5 All right. I'm going to write that on the
6 top of the page.
7 Now, the one telephone that we're dealing
8 with here belongs to Jay Jackson; is that correct?
9 A. Correct. The 9279.
10 Q. Okay. So I'm going to draw a telephone.
11 And I'm going to put "Jay Jackson" under it. And
12 now that you've looked at the other phone records,
13 you determined that that call was placed to who?
14 A. Chris Tucker's phone.
15 Q. Chris Tucker's phone. I'm going to draw
16 another telephone, not very well, by the way, and
17 I'm going to put the number "2" on the bar. That's
18 what you were doing if you were showing two calls,
19 correct?
20 A. Correct.
21 Q. And these two calls go from Jay Jackson's
22 telephone to Chris Tucker's telephone, correct?
23 A. Correct.
24 Q. So I'll write "Chris Tucker." And remind us
25 who Chris Tucker is.
26 A. He is an entertainer, comedian.
27 Q. And he was in the movies with Jackie Chan?
28 A. Yes. 8403

Q. There you go. And I'm going to do one other thing, if it's all right with you. I'm going to do an arrow at the end of the bar to show which direction those calls were going. Would that be all right?
A. Sounds good.
Q. Does that make sense to you?
Okay. And can you tell us what time of day those telephone calls occurred?
A. 6:11 and 6:14 p.m.
Q. Okay. So I'm going to write down 6:11 and 6:14 p.m. under the line.
May I approach the witness?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: I'll show you what I did.
Who's looking at this? Oh, that's right. Sorry.
MR. NICOLA: That's a beautiful chart.
MR. SANGER: Thank you. Others will be the judge of that.
THE WITNESS: You appear to have paid more attention in art class than I did.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: There you go. All right.
I want to ask you, does that appear to be an accurate depiction?
A. Correct.
MR. SANGER: Your Honor, I would move into evidence 5011.
THE COURT: It's admitted. 8404

MR. SANGER: Thank you. And I'd ask permission to place that up on the board.
THE COURT: You may.
MR. SANGER: Thank you. Or on the screen.
Q. Okay. Did it the old-fashioned way.
Now, does that accurately represent -- I don't want to beat this to death here, but does that accurately represent the date at the top, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And then we have a call from Jay Jackson's telephone, two calls, 6:11 and 6:14 p.m., to Chris Tucker's telephone, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
All right. Now I want to go to some other telephone calls at the end. And let me take this down. I'm sorry, not at the end. I want to go to the middle, to 2-11. Excuse me.
Oh, I'm sorry, excuse me. Before I leave that, you have the book up there with the 200 series, I believe; is that correct?
A. Appears to be from -- correction. Or -- it is the 200 series.
Q. So if you look at Exhibit 223 --
And that's already been received into evidence, Your Honor, and I'm going to ask permission to put that up.
THE COURT: All right. 8405

MR. SANGER: Thank you.
Q. There's two pages to 223; is that correct, sir?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. The first page I'll put up on the board, and that's the itinerary that we've seen -- you weren't in the room, I don't think, but we've seen this before. It's an itinerary for a flight that apparently did not occur, no tickets were issued on this. But it's an itinerary. But do you see that? Do you recognize that to be what it is?
MR. NICOLA: Objection; lack of foundation, Judge.
THE COURT: Overruled.
You may answer.
THE WITNESS: I recognize it as an itinerary. However, I'm not familiar enough with it to tell you whether or not a ticket was issued or not.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: That's fair enough. In any event, there's an itinerary there, and that's for a flight that's scheduled to go at two o'clock in the afternoon; is that correct?
A. It appears to be the case.
Q. All right. And if we look at -- keeping that in mind for a moment, if we look at page two down at the bottom, there's a fax transmittal that shows this document was faxed or attempted to be faxed at 11:31 in the morning on February 5, 8406

1 correct?
2 A. Correct.
3 Q. It shows, “NG,” it didn’t go through, but at
4 least they were trying to fax it at that time,
5 correct?
6 A. Correct.
7 Q. All right. Now, on your February 5
8 document, if we look at page -- if the summary is
9 page one, then this would be page three. It’s the
10 second page of phone summary records.
11 A. Okay.
12 Q. All right. Did I tell you Exhibit 859?
13 A. That’s correct.
14 Q. Did I say that? Okay. So that’s for the
15 5th of February. And if you look down the list --
16 Your Honor, may I inquire of counsel?
17 Has this page been changed?
18 THE WITNESS: I don’t believe so.
19 MR. SANGER: Okay. May I inquire of the
20 witness? All right. Why don’t I just approach so
21 we don’t have a problem, Your Honor.
22 THE COURT: You may.
23 Q. BY MR. SANGER: Let me just make sure
24 we’re -- maybe compare the top and the bottom to see
25 if they’re the same.
26 A. Yes.
27 MR. SANGER: Okay. May I publish this page?
28 It’s already been admitted. 8407

THE COURT: Yes.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: It actually says page two of three at the bottom, sir?
A. That's correct.
Q. It's actually page three of the exhibit, because the first page is your summary, right?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. I'll put that up. Let's see if it settles there.
All right. I'm hoping it's going to get a little clearer, but it doesn't seem to want to do that. I guess we cut off part of it here. Let's see if that....
All right. Before I refer to -- I'm going to refer to this particular line here.
A. Can you show me which one again?
Q. Yeah, it's -- there you go. You have to hold it just right. I'm going to refer to this particular line here, which is 2-5-03 at 9:58.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay? And before we talk about that particularly, let me ask you some general questions that will cover other entries as well.
In general, through your investigation in this case, did you determine that when Mr. Jackson travels, the people that arrange his travel often will take a name that is not Mr. Jackson's name and use that for the purpose of booking hotels? 8408

A. That's correct.
Q. And is that something common with celebrities, to book rooms under other names, whether it's a staff person or just a fictitious name?
A. I don't have personal knowledge. This is the only instance that I've personally been involved in.
Q. All right. Have you ever seen other celebrities book rooms?
A. No.
Q. Okay. All right. Anyway, it makes sense to you. You don't want to put your own name down there if you're going to attract a lot of attention, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And sometimes in your investigation, just to cover the big picture, you will see in the documents that the name that is used appears to have -- the last name that's used appears to have no relation to anybody we know of, right?
A. Correct.
Q. So it just might be a name like "Mason" or something like that; is that correct?
A. Could be, yes.
Q. On the other hand, sometimes you'll see rooms are booked in the name of somebody who is actually working for MJJ Productions or in some 8409

other way associated with that organization, such as Chris Carter?
A. Correct.
Q. So Chris Carter might reserve rooms in his name, right?
A. Correct.
Q. You never saw rooms reserved in the name of Michael Jackson himself, correct?
A. No.
Q. All right. And the records are kept openly in that regard, correct? In other words, through the records that you found both at Neverland and from the various places where records were subpoenaed or obtained by search warrants, internally there was no effort to hide the fact that these were Mr. Jackson's rooms, right?
A. No.
Q. All right. So, going to these -- we can look at all these rooms down here. These are basically a series of phone numbers that are associated with rooms or suites at that hotel; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And the Presidential Suite, or the top one that we're looking at here, was a multi-room suite; is that correct?
A. I don't know for certain. I just simply went off the records themselves. 8410

Q. In your investigation, the course of your investigation, did you determine that the Presidential Suite was a multi-room suite?
A. Not personally, no.
Q. You heard that though?
A. I have heard that, yes.
Q. Do you know how many telephones were located in that suite?
A. I do not.
Q. Do you know how many people associated with MJJ Productions or with other people in this case, or in or out of this case, how many people were associated with that room?
A. I don't know.
Q. Do you know how many people came in and out of that room?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Do you know how many people -- how many people used the phone or phones in that room?
A. Of course not.
Q. Pardon?
A. Of course not.
Q. Yeah, okay. That's a question like Tuesday comes before Wednesday. I just wanted to get it on the record. Thank you.
Okay. Now, as we look here, this appears -- this particular call appears to have occurred at 8411

9:58 in the morning, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. That's two minutes of 10:00, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And that would have been Florida time, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And Florida is three hours -- what time would it be in California if it was 9:58 in Florida?
A. It would be two minutes before 7 a.m., California time.
Q. All right. So there's some call from somebody at two minutes to 7:00 that lasts 27 minutes that was placed from the Turnberry and was made to Jay Jackson, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, in the course of your investigation, I think we've already shown you, and I won't put it back up, Exhibit 223. That at least has an itinerary for people to fly commercially at two o'clock on the 5th, right?
A. Correct.
Q. In the course of your investigation, you determined that in fact, Chris Tucker was the person who arranged for a private jet to take the Arvizos to Florida; is that correct?
A. That is my understanding.
Q. And you do not have any other calls, other 8412

than those on the 4th, between members associated with the Arvizos - that is, Jay Jackson and the Venturas or anybody else associated with the Arvizos - and Chris Tucker; is that correct?
A. I believe there was one call later on that we covered.
Q. When was that?
A. It was in the March time frame.
Q. Okay. I'm sorry, I meant in this time period, February the 4th and the 5th, regarding this flight to Miami.
A. No. No.
Q. Okay. All right. Now I'd like to turn to Exhibit 458, if we can, please, and I'll take this off in a moment. And 458 relates to whom?
A. You'll have to bring me the record.
Q. Oh, I'm sorry.
May I approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. SANGER: Sure.
Q. 458 relates to whom?
A. This appears to be a billing for Jay Jackson telephone line.
Q. And what company?
A. I believe this is the Talk America records.
Q. And that would be the long-distance carrier for Jay Jackson? 8413

A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So the phone records that we just saw up on the board were the local phone records for Jay Jackson; is that correct?
A. Or local toll or -- yeah. Not long distance.
Q. Not long distance. There are toll charges?
A. Correct.
Q. But not technically long distance.
All right. So looking at 458, these appear to indicate phone calls made long distance by Jay Jackson. And if I'm correct -- if you'll bear with me, just hold on to that. Don't go anywhere for a moment.
Look at your exhibits that you just talked about today, Exhibits 859 through 881, whatever it was, and you testified to some of them, but not all of them, we know that, okay? And I'm going to ask you to look in particular at 862 and 863.
While the witness is doing that, I'd like to have marked next in order two more blank pieces of paper.
THE COURT: You may.
MR. SANGER: Thank you. Separate numbers.
Q. All right. Are you looking at 862 and 863?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Not a big thing. It's just you jump -- 862 is for February the 8th, and then the 8414

next summary chart you have is for February the 12th; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. All right. So you did not do a summary chart for February the 11th, correct?
A. No.
Q. Now, on February 11th, based on your investigation, the night of February 11th, right at the end of the night, were you aware that Janet Arvizo had asked somebody to give her a ride?
A. The 11th or the 12th. I'm not sure which day.
Q. And the ride actually occurred at -- the ride -- the Rolls Royce left the ranch at about 1:52 in the morning; is that correct?
A. The person I interviewed wasn't real certain about times, so --
Q. You're familiar with the gate logs, right?
A. Yes. But --
Q. Did you look at the entries on the gate logs?
A. I did. But not having them in front of me, I couldn't state with certainty.
Q. Whatever time it was, it was sometime in the early morning hours of the 12th when the Rolls Royce left the property; is that your understanding?
A. Yes.
Q. So my question was, were you aware that she 8415

was asking, around midnight, somewhere just before midnight on the 11th, for a ride?
A. That is my understanding, yes.
Q. All right. There you go.
So on the 11th, I want to follow the same procedure, with the Court's permission, and I'm going to write up at the top "02-11-03." And since the 12th was a Wednesday, the 11th had to be a Tuesday. We learned that. Right?
A. Sounds good.
Q. Okay. And now I'm going to ask, with the Court's permission, to put up page two of Exhibit 458.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. SANGER: All right.
Q. Page two of 458. All right. Now, referring to -- I'm going to refer to these three calls down here. Hit the line numbers, I'll make it easier. Referring to these three calls down here that say "Santa Barbara," so that looks like 17, 18 and 19, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And I think you told us these are the phone records of Jay Jackson, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. The long-distance phone records, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And it appears that on line 17, on 2-11-03 8416

at 2322 hours -- that would be 11:22 at night, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Jay Jackson calls from Los Angeles, where his phone's located, to Santa Barbara, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then you look right below it, at 2323, in other words, one minute later, he makes another call to Santa Barbara, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then on the 19th -- I'm sorry, on line 19, the same evening, at 2349 or 11:49 at night, he makes another call to Santa Barbara, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So, once again, I'm going to draw one of those little phones and I'm going to put "Jay Jackson" under it, and I'm going to put -- there's two different numbers that are called, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. I'm going to put two arrows, do it a little differently than your chart, but not much, and I'll put "1" for one number and "2" for the other numbers, and then I will draw two phones quickly. All right. Now, let me ask you if you recognize the first number that was called on that evening.
A. The 2300 number?
Q. Yeah. 8417

A. I'm not certain, but it may be the Santa Barbara Police Department.
Q. The Santa Barbara -- that's the Santa Barbara Police Department in downtown Santa Barbara, correct?
A. The police department as opposed to the sheriff's department.
Q. Yes, sir. I was going to let you explain that. For those who don't know, but probably everybody does, the police department has jurisdiction over the City of Santa Barbara?
A. Within the city limits, correct.
Q. Within the city limits in the South County?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. The sheriff's department has jurisdiction over the entire county, but primarily the incorporated areas; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And I guess by contract, some of the unincorporated areas like Buellton, Solvang, so on?
A. A few of them, yes.
Q. Okay. So the first call we believe is to the police department, right?
A. It's my guess, based on the number.
Q. Okay. So I'm going to put a little shield-looking thing there that says "SBPD," and I'm going to show you this in a minute.
The next two calls are made to what number? 8418

A. (805) 683-2724.
Q. What number is that?
A. I don't know.
Q. Is that the sheriff's department, by any chance?
A. It's not a number I recognize as being the sheriff's department.
Q. All right. So you don't know that number at this point?
A. No.
Q. So I'm going to just write "2724" on there. I won't put the whole number down. And then we'll deal with that later.
May I approach the witness, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Yes.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: I'm just going to ask you to take a look at that.
THE COURT: State the exhibit number.
MR. SANGER: Yes, I'm sorry.
THE WITNESS: 5012. And it appears to be an accurate representation.
MR. SANGER: Thank you.
MR. NICOLA: May I see that?
MR. SANGER: Oh, yeah.
MR. NICOLA: Thank you.
MR. SANGER: I'd move 5012 in.
THE COURT: It's admitted.
MR. SANGER: Thank you. May I publish it? 8419

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: By now everybody's got it, all right?
Q. So we have -- on 2-11, we've got three calls from Jay Jackson to numbers in Santa Barbara. One is the Santa Barbara police, we believe, and the other is a number ending in 2724?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you.
All right. I'd like you to go to Exhibit 451, Tab No. 5.
And, Your Honor, I'm going to follow the same procedure, with the Court's permission, with one variation. Rather than doing a separate page for a number of days, one separate page for each day over a number of days, I will do one page for a series of phone calls over a series of days.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. SANGER: Thank you.
Q. I'm going to ask you to look at the -- under No. 5, tell me whose phone records those are.
A. These are the phone records for David Ventura, Janet Arvizo's parents.
Q. Now, you did not do all of the summary charts in this case. I think we've established that.
A. Correct.
Q. Would you agree that the last summary chart 8420

that was prepared and submitted, although you haven't testified to it - somebody else will - will be Exhibit 882?
A. That's correct.
Q. And so the last summary chart, then, was for March the 12th of 2003?
A. Correct.
Q. And what was the significance of the date March the 12th, 2003?
A. The 12th was the day we believed the Arvizo family left Neverland Ranch.
Q. All right. Now -- may I approach just to make sure we have the same pages here?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: Thank you.
Q. We're looking at Exhibit -- I shouldn't talk up here, so excuse me. I just want you to look at these pages here.
A. 8-1.
Q. And dash 2.
MR. SANGER: Your Honor, if I may speak loudly just briefly so I can get oriented.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. SANGER: Thank you.
Q. On these, I believe you have to look at the date of the bill and then reference the page numbers. Do you want to --
A. I just got to find it. 8421

Q. Okay. Excuse me one second.
A. Okay. I have them all.
Q. Why don't you put a post-it sign on each one of those that you just found.
All right. Now, Exhibit 882, the reason I put post-its there, I need to flip back and forth a little bit. So look at Exhibit 882, first of all, 8-8-2. 882, that's the exhibit number. Sorry to say it three times.
That's a summary chart for 3-12-03, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. On that summary chart - I realize you did not prepare it, and I'm not going to go into any detail except to ask, do any of the phone calls to Buellton or Guadalupe that are shown on Exhibit 451, Tab 5, the page that says March 26th, 8-1 -- 8-1 of 9, that's the first half -- the first post-it.
Are any of those phone calls shown on that summary chart?
A. Do you mean the calls from the --
Q. The David Ventura telephone to Buellton and Guadalupe on the 12th.
A. On 2-12?
No, they're not.
MR. SANGER: All right. Now, Your Honor, may I put up that page of Exhibit 451-5, and it's the March 26th, 8-1 of 9.
THE COURT: Yes. 8422

MR. SANGER: And I did this before, Your Honor, and I apologize. And I apologize, there's some little pen marks there that should be ignored. They're not on the original exhibit.
Q. But I'd like to direct your attention to the telephone calls here to -- on March the 12th. It's Line No. 4, March the 12th, 5:08 p.m. to Buellton. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. About a four-minute call?
A. Four-minute call, correct.
Q. And March the 12th, a 7:02 call to Buellton, a one-minute call, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And March the 12th at 11:25 p.m. to Guadalupe, 35-minute call?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. Now, I'm going to put at the top of this page -- there's an overlap, because you already have a 3-12 exhibit, but I'm going to overlap and it's going to be 03-12-03 to 03-21-03. And then we're going to start with the telephone number that this comes from, and I'm going to risk drawing another telephone here.
And whose phone do all of these calls come from on those three pages that I've asked you to look at on page Exhibit 451, Tab 5?
A. David Ventura. 8423

Q. I'm going to write "David Ventura. And based on your investigation, by 3-12-03, you believed that the children, as well as Janet Arvizo, had left the ranch; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And they went to David Ventura's house; is that correct?
A. I'm not certain where they went, but I do know they left.
Q. All right. Now, I'm just going to look at the phone number that ends in 5002, which is shown here on line 6, all right? It says "Guadalupe," line 6, 5002, okay?
Did you determine whose telephone that was?
A. No.
Q. Okay. I'll put a phone there, and I'm going to write the last digits of the number, "5002," and I'll put "in Guadalupe."
All right. Now what we'll do is, we'll start here with what we have, and I'm going to put arrows for these various phone calls from the David Ventura telephone to the 5002 phone in Guadalupe. And I'm going to put the date and time on each call, because this chart is going to span several days.
So when's the first call to Guadalupe?
A. The first call to Guadalupe was at 11:25 p.m.
Q. So I'll put -- it was on 3-12-03, correct? 8424

A. Correct.
Q. 11:25 p.m. All right. When's the next call to Guadalupe? I think if you look at the page that's on the screen there.
A. March 13th, 8:45 p.m.
Q. And while we're at it, I'm going to put down the duration here. So the first call was a duration of 35 minutes; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. The second call?
A. 64 minutes.
Q. 64 minutes. Okay. Now, I'm going to -- are there any other calls to Guadalupe on that page?
A. No.
Q. All right. With the Court's permission, I'll go to the next page, 451, Tab 5. What's the next call to Guadalupe?
A. March 14th, 8:12 p.m.
Q. How many minutes?
A. One minute.
Q. The next call?
A. March 16th?
Q. Yes.
A. 26 minutes.
Q. What time was that?
A. 12:01 a.m.
Q. 12:01 a.m. So one minute after midnight?
A. Correct. 8425

Q. And how many minutes? I'm sorry.
A. 26 minutes.
Q. Okay. Next?
A. March 16th, 10:14 p.m., six minutes.
Q. Next call?
A. March 17th, 7 -- 6:28 p.m., one minute.
Q. Next call?
A. March 17th, 8:51 p.m., one minute.
Q. Yes. Next one?
A. March 17th, 8:57 p.m., one minute.
Q. And again, when you say one-minute calls, they could be less than that?
A. Correct.
Q. Somebody picks it up and they say, "He's not here."
A. Correct.
Q. Next call?
A. March 18th, 3:26 p.m., 22 minutes.
Q. Okay.
A. March 18th, 9:29 p.m., 26 minutes.
Q. 26 minutes.
All right. And then I'll put up the last page from -- or the third page I identified from Exhibit 451, Tab 5, and ask if that shows additional calls and times.
A. It does.
Q. And if you'd go ahead, and we'll continue to add them here. 8426

A. 3-19, 1910, or 7:10 p.m., 36 minutes.
Q. Okay. Go ahead.
A. 3-19, 8:01 p.m., 17 minutes.
Q. Yes.
A. 3-19, 10:50 p.m., three minutes.
Q. Okay.
A. 3-20, 2:57 p.m., three minutes.
Q. Yes.
A. 3-20, 7:52 p.m., three minutes.
Q. Okay.
A. 3-20, 7:55 p.m., 20 minutes.
Q. So it looks like 7:52, there was a hang-up and then a call back pretty much right away; is that right?
A. Appears to be the case.
Q. And that last one was 20 minutes; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay.
A. And finally, 3-21, 9:37 p.m., one minute.
MR. SANGER: All right. May I approach the witness --
THE COURT: Yes.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: Ask you to take a look at this and see if that's --
THE COURT: Give us the exhibit number.
MR. SANGER: Yes, I'm sorry, that's Exhibit No. 5013. 8427

THE WITNESS: It appears to be correct.
MR. SANGER: All right. May I retrieve the exhibit?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: Thank you.
And I would move into evidence 5013 and ask to publish it.
THE COURT: All right. It's admitted.
MR. SANGER: Thank you.
Q. All right. We won't go over all this again, but this is a summary of what you just testified to, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. Now, we talked about that phone number and -- well, it ends in 5002. We don't have to say the whole number again here. Do you know if anybody -- as one of the detectives in the case, do you know if anybody made an effort to find out whose number that was?
A. No.
Q. Do you know if the defense turned over information to the prosecution indicating whose number that was?
A. I don't know, no.
Q. Do you know if anybody tried to find a number for a Mr. Vivanco?
A. I have -- somebody has asked me to go in -- we went in and researched our record and found no 8428

record other than a Santa Maria number for him.
Q. You found a number for Mr. Vivanco?
A. Yes, but he gave our sheriff's detectives,
when we served a search warrant in November of 2003,
he gave a Santa Maria number.
Q. And you -- did you go along and interview
him at that time?
A. I didn't interview him. I was at Neverland,
but that was the phone number that was given to the
detective who put it onto his report.
Q. Okay. So you checked that phone number from
November and it's a different number than this
number; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Have you subsequently learned, from
information turned over from the defense, that there
is some relationship between Mr. Vivanco and that
number?
A. No. I --
MR. NICOLA: Objection, Your Honor. Asked
and answered.
THE COURT: Overruled. The answer was,
"No." Next question.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: Have you done anything to
follow up on that, to your knowledge? And by "you,"
I mean your department.
MR. NICOLA: Objection, Your Honor, it calls
for speculation. And it's asked and answered. It's 8429

beyond the scope.
THE COURT: Overruled.
You may answer.
THE WITNESS: Again, I have not personally had anything to do with attempting to find out what that number comes back to. I was asked to research Vivanco to find out what number he gave to us and that's what I did.
MR. SANGER: Okay. All right. I'll take that down now, Your Honor.
Q. All right. I want to go through just a few of your summary charts here and try to do it in a way that is representative, rather than going through every single thing.
First of all, in your analysis of the phone records, you determined that there are a lot of telephone calls that are placed to phone numbers associated with Evvy Tavasci; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you understand that Evvy Tavasci works for MJJ Productions; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And she's also responsible for securing phones for a number of people; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. She also has other people who assist her in the office; is that your understanding?
A. One other person that I know of, yes. 8430

Q. Okay. And is it also your understanding that Miss Tavasci tends to be the person that people go to at MJJ Productions to obtain information, make reservations, all that sort of thing?
A. I know that she is the administrative assistant, but I think that's what she does, based on what she's described to us.
Q. Okay. The District Attorney several times referred to her as Mr. Jackson's personal assistant. Did you hear that?
A. I did.
Q. Okay. And in addition to that, she fulfills the function of facilitating the purchase of supplies, tickets, travel arrangements, all sorts of things; is that right?
A. I would believe that to be the case.
Q. Okay. So she's not just doing this for Mr. Jackson. She is working for -- or she is providing these services to anybody associated with MJJ Productions who needs to have such things; is that right?
MR. NICOLA: I'll object. Lack of foundation. Compound.
THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. SANGER: On compound or lack of foundation?
THE COURT: Lack of foundation.
MR. SANGER: Okay. 8431

Q. Based on your investigation, did you determine what her duties were, what Evvy Tavasci's duties were?
MR. NICOLA: Objection. Relevance at this point.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: Based on the investigation, I think we've seen a few different things that, in addition to coordinating for Mr. Jackson's personal calendar, that she also is a coordinator for travel arrangements for various other subjects.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: All right. Now, the summary charts in general show that there's a bunch of people, or at least their telephones, talking to each other here during a period of time. That's pretty much what you're showing, right?
A. Correct.
Q. You're aware that a number of these people were involved in putting together rebuttal videos, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Based on your investigation, there was the first rebuttal video, the actual one that was aired, that was hosted by Maury Povich; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And then there was a second one called, "Michael Jackson Home Movies"; is that right?
A. I don't know if that was a rebuttal, but I 8432

do remember that we have a video of that.
Q. All right. During the period of time that Mr. Schaffel was involved, based on your review of the records and as a lead detective in this case, you were aware that he was working on doing a three-television-show package surrounding Mr. Jackson at this period of time; is that right?
MR. NICOLA: Objection, Your Honor. Relevance to this testimony. Beyond the scope.
THE COURT: Sustained.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: All right. I'd like to go to February the 7th and I would like to -- I'm not sure I have the absolute latest chart on each one of these. I'm not saying it wasn't given to me this morning, but I'm not sure that I have the latest on each one. So I'd like you to look at that and then I'm going to take it away from you and put it on the board, if I may.
May I approach for that purpose?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Do you need the Excel sheets also?
MR. SANGER: I'll leave those with you. I'll just take this. Thank you.
Q. So this is the first page of 861, which is the summary, and I'm putting that up on the board. And again, I'm not going to go through all 8433

1 of these. I've skipped there. I'm going to skip a
2 few more places and then we'll be done. But just of
3 interest, you had -- there you go -- you had
4 commented on these telephone calls that are in the
5 upper right-hand corner?
6 A. Correct.
7 Q. Now, you do not have directions on your
8 lines. You don't have arrows. You just have lines.
9 A. No.
10 Q. Hence, we were talking about whether it was
11 placed to or placed from a different number,
12 correct?
13 A. Correct.
14 Q. You also -- well, we're going to have to use
15 this as -- you also have some lines that go from one
16 place in a straight line down to another place.
17 This does not suggest that these are pass-through
18 calls or three-way calls or anything like that,
19 correct?
20 A. No, they do not.
21 Q. It's just a chart that shows these phone
22 calls went there, and that phone was used to make
23 some other phone calls, right?
24 A. Correct.
25 Q. So the connections are -- the important
26 connections in the chart are really just between one
27 phone and another, correct?
28 A. That's correct. 8434

Q. All right. So let's go back up to this corner here where we're at. And all of these calls, there are 16 phone calls from the Gavin Franklin rooms at the Turnberry -- I'm sorry, let me withdraw.
There are 13 phone calls from the Gavin Franklin room at the Turnberry to Jay Jackson, or Jay Jackson's phone, and the grandparents' phone or Janet's parents' phone, right?
A. Correct.
Q. All of those calls were made on Mr. Jackson's nickel, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So in other words, they're charged to the room. There is also three phone calls from the Xtra Jet flying up in the air to the Ventura telephone number, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And once again, all of these phone calls were placed to those two phones. There were no calls that were made back to either the Turnberry or to the Xtra Jet?
A. Correct.
Q. And when we say "Turnberry," if there were, they would show up over here, correct, to the resort main number?
A. Correct.
Q. So there are no phone calls from either the 8435

David Ventura phone or the Jay Jackson phone to the Turnberry Hotel itself at all, to any phone number there, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Let me skip ahead here, and we'll go to 864.
May I approach to exchange documents?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: Let me give you 861.
Okay. Thank you.
May I put 864 up?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: Thank you.
Q. Again, we'll just take a representative instance here to talk about them, and rather than going through all the phone calls. Looking at the calls between Ann Kite and Geragos & Geragos, there are four calls there, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Two of the calls were one minute long; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Three of the calls -- I may be wrong -- three of the calls were placed in the same minute; isn't that right?
A. Correct.
Q. So to add to Mr. Nicola's conspiracy theory with the phone company, they managed to charge for 8436

three minutes, all of the calls made in the very same minute, right?
A. That's correct.
Q. All right. That doesn't mean that Ann Kite actually talked to a lawyer at Geragos & Geragos four times?
A. No. Two times.
Q. It strongly suggests that, at most, there was -- there was one or two phone calls that might have gotten through to somebody; is that true?
A. Probably two that were conversations.
Q. Okay. All right. I'm going to skip ahead to Exhibit 866.
And may I do the same thing, approach and exchange here?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: May I put 866 up?
THE COURT: Yes.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: All right. Now, this is for February the 15th, and this is the second time that Rudy Provencio's phone number shows up; is that correct?
A. I believe so.
Q. All right. So for Rudy Provencio we had oneth -- "oneth," sorry. Let me try it again.
For Rudy Provencio, we had one call on February 8th, and then another call on February 15th? 8437

A. Correct.
Q. All right. I'd like to direct your attention now to the phone calls here. We have Jay Jackson and Frank Cascio. There are 18 calls. I'm sorry -- well, I'm not sure.
You have 14, and I have I guess an earlier version that says 18. How many calls were there between Frank Cascio and Jay Jackson's phone, Frank Cascio's phone and Jay Jackson's phone?
A. 14.
Q. Okay. Of those 14 calls, how many calls were placed from Jay Jackson, Jay Jackson's phone to Frank Cascio's phone?
A. Eight of the calls.
Q. I'm sorry, eight?
A. Eight.
Q. And of the five phone calls from the Ventura phone, how many phone calls were made from the Ventura phone to the Cascio phone?
A. There was one call from the Ventura phone to the Cascio phone.
Q. And so one of the five, somebody in the Ventura residence called Frank Cascio's phone, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And that call lasted for eight minutes and 22 seconds; is that correct?
A. Correct. 8438

MR. SANGER: All right. May I approach again, Your Honor, just to compare a page?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: Now, Detective -- oh, excuse me one second.
THE COURT: Counsel, it's necessary to break early. We'll take our break early.
(Recess taken.)
THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. SANGER: May I proceed?
Q. All right. Just for reference, we have Exhibit 866 --
BAILIFF CORTEZ: Microphone, sir.
MR. SANGER: Oops.
Q. Just for reference, we have Exhibit 866 up on the board, which is where it was when we took our break. And we were talking about the 14 telephone calls between the Cascio phone and the Jay Jackson residence phone, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you had told us that in your summary you had identified eight of those 14 calls as being placed by Jay Jackson's phone or from Jay Jackson's phone to the Cascio phone, correct?
A. Correct.
MR. SANGER: All right. Now, with the Court's permission, I'll put up the last page of 866, which is actually marked 3 of 3, but it's the 8439

fourth page, because that's the first page.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. SANGER: That's a little crooked there.
Sorry.
Q. Okay. And on your summary page you summarized the phone records by putting this into a spreadsheet computer program, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you have the eight phone calls here from the phone at Jay Jackson's house to the Frank Cascio telephone, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And these eight phone calls, all on the 15th, right? They're all on the 15th? That was the question. Sorry.
A. That's correct.
Q. And that would have been the day before the Brad Miller interview; is that correct?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. And these particular eight phone calls all last a number of minutes; is that correct?
A. With the exception of the third to the last one, which was less than one minute. I'm sorry. And the three up from that is also less than one minute. You have one for 47 seconds, and one for 57 seconds.
Q. Yes, absolutely. Actually, sorry, I was looking at the wrong column. 8440

Okay. So let me point here. All right?
Let's just go through very quickly, and we'll just round it off. We've got a six-and-a-half-minute call; a three-and-a-half-minute call; a call that's three seconds short of a minute; eight seconds over a minute; a minute and a half; 47 seconds; four minutes and 15 seconds; two minutes and six seconds, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And we also see that these telephone calls were placed from 10 -- that's 10:17 in the morning to 8:48 at night; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then you also have the call that was placed to Mr. Cascio's phone from the Venturas' residence. That was at 8:22 in the morning, and that lasted for two minutes, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. So basically you have more calls being made from these phone numbers to Mr. Cascio's phone than you do from Mr. Cascio's phone to these two numbers?
A. That's correct.
Q. Looks like somebody was trying to get ahold of Mr. Cascio and talk to him, or somebody at Mr. Cascio's phone, correct?
A. I don't know that I can say what they were trying to do, but I can say that they were calling numerous times. 8441

Q. All right. Now, we have the -- we have these eight phone calls you just talked about. And I'm going to put up -- let me take off that page, which is 866, and I'll put it back together with the exhibit and I'll deliver that up to you in just a moment.
Your Honor, with the Court's permission, I'm going to put up Exhibit 458. And this would be page 2 of 458.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. SANGER: Is that going to work? Excuse me one second. Can I borrow your stapler? It's on this podium here and kind of bubbling up. See if that makes it any better. I don't know if that makes it better or worse. It doesn't, all right.
Q. The point of this is -- I showed you this at the break; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you counted there are actually 12 phone calls to the phone number of -- associated with Mr. Cascio from Mr. Jackson's telephone; is that correct?
A. 12 attempts or phone calls, yes.
Q. All right. And in essence, you eliminated four of those and you only showed eight -- I'm sorry, Major Jackson, Jay Jackson's telephone. When we're talking about Jackson here, we're talking 8442

about Jay Jackson.
A. Understood.
Q. Okay. Make sure there's no question.
And in fact, this Exhibit 458 is an exhibit
from the phone records of Major Jay Jackson,
correct?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. And your understanding is this
was a land-based phone in his house?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So back to our story, it's very hard
to read there because of the glassine envelope, but
it's 2-15, February 15th. Those are all February
15th calls and there are 12 of them, correct?
A. There are 12 calls or attempts to call,
correct.
Q. And you did not include some of these in
your summary charts because you felt that they were
too short?
A. Yes, there were several of them that were
two, three seconds and less -- and the other two
that were less than 30 seconds.
Q. So there are a couple that are just a couple
of seconds. And I can't read it from here, but
there was one 15 seconds, I think.
Anyway, your criteria was if they broke it
down, if they broke it down into seconds less than a
minute, you would eliminate anything under 30 8443

1 seconds, correct?
2 A. We did that with all records, correct.
3 Q. All right. But if they didn't break it down
4 and they said one minute, then you would record it?
5 A. We have no other way of doing it, correct.
6 Q. So using those criteria you eliminated four
7 of these calls, right?
8 A. Correct.
9 Q. But nevertheless -- as an evidentiary or as
10 a matter of your investigation, nevertheless, it
11 does show that somebody from Jay Jackson's phone was
12 at least dialing the number for Mr. Cascio's phone;
13 is that correct?
14 A. That is correct.
15 Q. And it was dialed a total of 12 times from
16 Jay Jackson's phone and one time from David
17 Ventura's phone, right?
18 A. Correct.
19 Q. And more calls were dialed -- in fact, more
20 calls were completed to the Cascio phone than were
21 made from the Cascio phone to those phones; is that
22 correct?
23 A. Correct.
24 Q. So you would agree that for the purpose of
25 getting down to the actual facts here, the original
26 exhibits being the exhibits of the actual phone
27 records, are going to be more detailed and more
28 reliable than the summary charts; is that correct? 8444

A. More detailed --
MR. NICOLA: I'm going to object. That's argumentative, Your Honor.
MR. SANGER: Let's start with more detailed.
MR. NICOLA: They're different records.
MR. SANGER: Let me withdraw it so it's not compound.
THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: Would you agree that there would be more detail in the actual records than shows up in the summary charts?
A. Correct. Yes.
Q. And you identified at least one chart where the -- there was actually an error, correct?
A. Correct. 3-9.
Q. Okay. And 879?
And may I approach? And I'll exchange 866.
I don't want to leave these things out of the book, so if I may --
THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
MR. SANGER: Okay. Thank you. Oops. Yes.
879, that's right.
I think it was offered. I think this was received, 879? It was -- it was shown and I think it was found to be in error, but I'd like to put it up.
THE COURT: It's in evidence, I think. The error was found later. 8445

MR. SANGER: Okay. May I put it up?
THE COURT: Yes.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: And the error on 879 is that there were not 12 calls between a phone associated with Evvy Tavasci and Marc Schaffel, but instead, between Evvy Tavasci's phone and Neverland Ranch, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you -- based on your review of the records, you would expect, in the ordinary course of business, that Evvy Tavasci's phones would be in contact with Neverland Ranch, right?
A. At minimum, occasionally, yes.
Q. And you understood that Miko Brando, although he's the son of Marlon Brando, was an employee of MJJ Productions, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And he's one of the longer-term employees. He's been there a number of years; is that right?
A. I don't know.
MR. SANGER: May I have just a moment, Your Honor, please?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: Thank you.
All right. We can take this down. And may I approach to return it?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: And I have no further 8446

1 questions.
2 MR. NICOLA: May I have that exhibit again,
3 please? And 879, please.
4
5 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
6 BY MR. NICOLA:
7 Q. Detective Bonner, during the break, did you
8 make a correction to another copy of Exhibit 879,
9 which is the chart for March 9th of 2003?
10 A. I did.
11 MR. SANGER: Do you have a copy for me, or --
12 MR. NICOLA: I don't.
13 MR. SANGER: Okay. That's fine.
14 Q. BY MR. NICOLA: I'd like to put the 879 on
15 the board that we've already moved into evidence.
16 And I'd like to show you Exhibit No. 883 and ask if
17 this is your corrected exhibit.
18 A. It is.
19 Q. Using the original 879, could you just point
20 out for the jury what -- what the difference is?
21 And then we'll show 883 in a moment.
22 A. I recognize that the mistake that was made
23 is that on Marc Schaffel, the records say "Neverland
24 Valley Entertainment," and what we did is we
25 accidentally made a mix-up between Neverland Valley
26 Ranch and Neverland Valley Entertainment, so I have
27 relabeled "Neverland Valley Entertainment -
28 Schaffel" into "Neverland Valley Ranch," and 8447

1 “Neverland Valley Ranch” into “Marc Schaffel - NVE.”
2 And this connection has gone from here to here and
3 we have erased or removed this connection right
4 here.
5 Q. You did that yourself?
6 A. I did.
7 Q. Okay. And is that depicted on Exhibit 883?
8 A. It is.
9 MR. NICOLA: We’d offer that into evidence
10 at this time, Your Honor.
11 MR. SANGER: No objection, but I’d ask,
12 since nobody has a copy of it, if we might be
13 allowed to have a copy, if the clerk can make one,
14 if that would be possible.
15 THE COURT: That’s fine. I’ll admit it.
16 The clerk will give you a copy.
17 MR. NICOLA: Thank you, Your Honor.
18 And with the Court’s permission, I’d just
19 publish it just briefly.
20 THE COURT: Go ahead.
21 Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Okay. These are the changes
22 that you were talking about, Detective Bonner?
23 A. That’s correct. The switch of the name
24 here, and here, and then removing this connection
25 and making it go from here to here.
26 Q. Okay. Mr. Sanger was asking you about
27 dropping phone calls from your analysis that lasted
28 roughly 30 seconds or less. In particular with Jay 8448

Jackson's phone records found in Exhibit 458, did you follow that procedure for dropping numbers that were in the 30-second range and less for everybody?
A. Yes.
Q. So everyone who had seconds in their cell phone records, you would drop those calls?
A. Correct.
MR. SANGER: Objection. Asked and answered and actually misstates the testimony.
THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Did you drop calls that were 30 seconds or less on Frank Cascio's records?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. And Vinnie Amen's records?
A. I don't believe Vinnie Amen had any seconds on his.
Q. Just the ones that were billed in seconds that you could locate?
A. Correct.
Q. Let me ask you about the minutes. Specifically with respect to Exhibit 451, that's the exhibit that Mr. Sanger --
May I have your exhibit, please?
MR. SANGER: The ones we did?
MR. NICOLA: Uh-huh.
MR. SANGER: I gave them back to the clerk.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Specifically with respect to Exhibit No. 5011, now you testified under 8449

cross-examination that the call at 6:11 lasted four minutes and the call at 6:14 also lasted four minutes. And is it your understanding that a four-minute call on those records can be anywhere between three and four minutes?
A. Correct.
MR. NICOLA: Okay. I have no further questions, Judge.
RECROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. SANGER:
Q. You talked about getting Neverland Valley Entertainment confused with Neverland Ranch.
A. Correct.
Q. And Neverland Valley Entertainment was a separate entity, correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And it seemed to have been run by Marc Schaffel; is that correct?
A. Correct. Records came back to his home address.
Q. And did it appear to you that Marc Schaffel was attempting to use a similar name for the purpose of suggesting that he was part of Mr. Jackson's business enterprise?
MR. NICOLA: Objection, Your Honor. Calls for speculation. Beyond the scope of redirect.
THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. SANGER: Okay. Thank you. No further 8450

1 questions, Your Honor.
2 MR. NICOLA: No questions.
3 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You may
4 step down.
5 Call your next witness.
6 MR. NICOLA: We call Detective Paul Zelis,
7 Your Honor.
8 THE COURT: You may be seated. You're still
9 under oath.
10 DETECTIVE ZELIS: Thank you.
11
12 PAUL ZELIS
13 Having been previously sworn, resumed the
14 stand and testified further as follows:
15
16 DIRECT EXAMINATION
17 BY MR. NICOLA:
18 Q. Good afternoon.
19 A. Good afternoon.
20 Q. Detective Zelis, did you participate with
21 the team analyzing certain phone records for certain
22 dates arising out of the records which were seized
23 in this case?
24 A. Yes, I did.
25 Q. And to that end, did you examine the records
26 pertaining to these following days: February 17th
27 of 2003, February 18th of 2003, February 19th of
28 2003, March 10th of 2003, March 11th, and March 12th 8451

of 2003?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the phone records to the left of me, sitting on the end of counsel table? The other left.
A. Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, I am.
Q. Did you actually receive copies of all that and go through and --
A. Yes.
Q. I'd like to begin with the date of February 17th of 2003, and ask if you'd turn to the exhibit corresponding to that in the exhibit binder.
A. Okay.
Q. Is that Exhibit 868?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And have you gone over the contents of both the link chart on the front page and the supporting documents behind it?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And did you participate in creating both of those documents in 868?
A. I did.
Q. And to your knowledge, do the contents of 868 accurately reflect your analysis of the phone calls conducted on 2-17 of '03?
A. Yes, they do.
MR. NICOLA: Your Honor, we'd offer 868 into evidence. 8452

MR. SANGER: No objection.
THE COURT: It's admitted.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Detective Zelis, if you would just save us a step and go to Exhibit 869 and 870, I'd ask if 869 corresponds to February 18th.
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And if 870 corresponds to February 19th of 2003.
A. Yes.
Q. Do both of those exhibits accurately reflect your analysis of the phone calls on those particular days?
A. Yes, they do.
MR. NICOLA: We'd offer 869 and 870 into evidence at this time.
THE COURT: Admitted.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: If you could turn to Exhibit No. 880.
A. Okay.
Q. IS that one of your exhibits?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And what's the date on that?
A. March 10th of 2003.
Q. And how about 882?
A. Yes, that reflects March 12th of 2003.
Q. And right in the middle is 881, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Does the information contained in Exhibit 8453

880, 881 and 882 accurately reflect the analysis that you conducted on March 10th for the phone calls -- excuse me, for March 10th, March 11th and March 12th of 2003?
A. Yes, they do.
MR. NICOLA: We'd offer those into evidence at this time, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Admitted.
MR. SANGER: No objection.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Detective Zelis, if you could please turn back to Exhibit No. 868, we'll start with February 17th of 2003.
If I may have "Input 4," Your Honor.
Is this Exhibit 868 that is in the book?
A. Yes.
Q. If you could please describe the contents for the jury, please.
A. It is a visual graph that shows the calls between different parties on the date of February 17th, 2003.
Q. Could you be more specific and point to the sections with your laser and tell the jury what you're trying to convey with that exhibit?
A. This exhibit basically shows different parties involved, the number of calls between the two telephone numbers and how they are connected.
Q. Starting in the upper left-hand portion, you have a phone symbol, which we understand is 8454

connected to a Christopher Carter?
A. Correct.
Q. That's how these charts work, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you show 12 links between phones belonging to Mr. Carter and Mr. Jay Jackson?
A. Correct.
Q. Can you tell us when those phone calls first began and who placed them?
A. I'd have to refer to the Excel spreadsheet.
Q. Go ahead. It's attached, right?
A. Yes.
They began just shortly before ten o'clock at night. It shows 2151 hours, which is military for 9:51.
Q. And in which direction were those calls going?
A. All 12 calls were in the direction of Chris Carter to Jay Jackson.
Q. Were any of those 12 calls longer than one minute?
A. No, they show that all of them were exactly one minute long.
Q. And did they occur at a fairly regular interval?
A. The 12 calls are approximately 10 to 15 minutes apart.
Q. After the first four calls and at 2224 in 8455

the evening, was there a phone call placed from the
Carter phone to Neverland Valley Ranch?
A. Yes.
Q. And how long did that call last?
A. Four minutes.
Q. Was there another call immediately
thereafter to Neverland Valley Ranch from the Chris
Carter phone?
A. Yes. At 2228.
Q. After that phone call to Neverland Valley
Ranch, did the calls from the Chris Carter phone to
the Jay Jackson phone continue?
A. Yes.
Q. And did they continue at the same interval
of frequency, approximately 10, 15 minutes apart?
A. Yes.
Q. And were any of those calls longer than one
minute?
A. No.
Q. Of the four phone calls between Marc
Schaffel and Rudy Provencio, can you tell us how
many were going in which direction, please?
A. It shows the direction is Rudy Provencio to
Marc Schaffel.
Q. All four calls?
A. Correct.
Q. And the calls between Frank Cascio and
Vincent Amen, it appears there were seven of them. 8456

A. Yes.
Q. Were they in a predominantly one-sided direction or were they mixed?
A. Predominantly in one direction. The records -- or the record source is from T-Mobile, which belongs to Mr. Amen, and it shows five of the calls being incoming. Five of the seven, I should say.
Q. At what time were the calls between Jay Jackson's phone and Frank Cascio's phone?
A. Did you want the times? I'm sorry.
Q. Yes, the times.
A. The first call was at 1441 hours, which was at 2:41, and 1423, which is 2:23.
Q. And then which direction were the two calls going?
A. One was outgoing and one was incoming.
Q. So one in each direction?
A. Correct.
Q. Which one was first?
A. The call from Frank Cascio to Jay Jackson.
Q. How long did that call last?
A. Three minutes and 37 seconds.
Q. I'd like to turn your attention to Exhibit 869, please.
A. Okay.
Q. Is that the chart for February 18th?
A. Yes. 8457

Q. Can you tell us which phone initiated the call for the Jay Jackson symbol in the middle?
A. Jay Jackson.
Q. And which phone did he call first?
A. Christopher Carter.
Q. That registered for 33 seconds?
A. Correct. At six o'clock in the morning.
Q. At 6 a.m.?
A. Correct.
Q. When was the last call on the 17th from Christopher Carter to the Jay Jackson phone?
A. 2331, which would be at 11:31 at night.
Q. Okay. At what time was the call between the Jay Jackson phone and the Frank Cascio phone?
A. On the 18th?
Q. Yes. I'm sorry.
A. At 1806 hours, which would have been 6:06 in the evening.
Q. Was there a phone call between Frank Cascio and Vince Amen -- excuse me, Vince Amen at 26 minutes after midnight?
A. Yes.
Q. And after that phone call -- how long did that call last?
A. Six minutes and 27 seconds.
Q. After that phone call, was there a call between Frank Cascio's phone and Evvy Tavasci's home phone? 8458

A. Yes.
Q. And what time was that call?
A. 33 minutes past midnight.
Q. Okay. How long did that phone call last?
A. 15 minutes and 17 seconds.
Q. Was there a call placed after that particular call between Frank Cascio's phones and Vince Amen's phones?
A. I show another call between Frank Cascio and Vincent Amen.
Q. At what time?
A. At 1:39 in the morning.
Q. Okay. Detective Zelis, if you could proceed, please, to Exhibit No. 870 of the chart for February 19th.
A. Yes.
Q. Does this chart show additional phone calls between Rudy Provencio and Marc Schaffel?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. At least between their phones?
A. Yes.
Q. And included in the exhibit are phone calls between the phones of Christian Robinson, Vince Amen and Marc Schaffel, Neverland Valley Entertainment, correct?
A. Correct.
MR. SANGER: I'm sorry, I'm going to object that that's -- that's compound. 8459

MR. NICOLA: I'll rephrase.
THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: There are phone calls between the Christian Robinson phone and the Marc Schaffel phone, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And also between the Christian Robinson phone and the Vince Amen phone?
A. Correct.
Q. And also between the Vince Amen phone and the Marc Schaffel phone?
A. Yes.
Q. And three calls between the Vince Amen phone and the Hamid Moslehi phone?
A. Yes.
Q. And three calls between Vince Amen and the Jay Jackson phone, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And in the lower left-hand corner -- why don't you read it? Go ahead.
A. Frank Cascio to Marc Schaffel, there's six calls. Frank Cascio to Vincent Amen, ten calls. Frank Cascio to Jay Jackson, nine calls. And Frank Cascio to Neverland Valley Ranch, 13 calls.
Q. There appears to be one call from the Jay Jackson phone to Neverland Valley Ranch?
A. Yes.
Q. What time did that call occur? 8460

A. 1421 hours, which would be 2:21 in the afternoon.
Q. How many of the calls between the Frank Cascio phone and the Jay Jackson phone occurred prior to the time Neverland was called from Jay Jackson's line?
A. From Frank Cascio to Jay Jackson?
Q. Yes. Please.
A. I'm not showing --
Q. They were all afterwards?
A. Correct.
Q. At 8:05 p.m., 2005, was there an 18-minute call between Frank Cascio and Jay Jackson?
A. Yes, 18 minutes and 33 seconds.
MR. SANGER: Once again, it's not between the people, it's between the phones. I haven't objected each time, but --
THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. SANGER: Thank you.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Was there another seven-minute phone call between the phones of Mr. Cascio and Mr. Jackson at 7:20 -- excuse me, 2026?
A. Yes.
Q. And with respect to the phone calls between the Vince Amen phone and the Jay Jackson phone, can you tell us what time they began, please?
A. They began at 1050 hours, 10:50 in the morning. And ended at 2125, 9:25 in the evening. 8461

Q. And were they all from the Amen phone to the Jackson phone?
A. Yes.
Q. With respect to the ten calls between the Cascio phone and the Amen phone, can you give us a time range of when those occurred?
A. A time range of 11:07 in the morning to 2345, 11:45 at night.
Q. Why don't we proceed to the next exhibit in your set, Exhibit No. 881, please. That's March 10th.
A. Okay.
MR. SANGER: I have March 10th as 880.
Q. BY MR. NICOLA: Is that Exhibit 880?
A. Which date?
Q. Yes.
A. I'm sorry, which date?
Q. March 10th.
A. March 10th is 880. Eight-eight-zero.
Q. I'll be with you as soon as I find my chart. Why don't you tell the jury what's going on in this exhibit for this day, please.
A. We have one call between Jay Jackson's phone and Vincent Amen. We have one call between Vincent Amen and Rudy Provencio.
Q. Their phones, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. 8462

A. One -- or, I'm sorry. Five calls between Vincent Amen's phone and Marc Schaffel's phone. Four calls between Vincent Amen's phone and Neverland Valley Ranch phone. 13 calls between Neverland Valley Ranch phone and Frank Cascio phone. And one call between MJJ Productions/Miko Brando and Evelyn Tavasci's home.

Q. Can you tell us what time the call between the Amen phone and the Jay Jackson phone occurred, please?

A. At 1355 hours, which is 1:55. Afternoon.

Q. And with respect to the 13 calls from -- or between the Cascio phone and Neverland Valley Ranch phones, could you give us an approximate time spread of those?

A. From about 11:42 in the morning to 2320 at night.

Q. About a 12-hour spread?

A. Yes.

Q. How about the calls between the Vince Amen phone and the Neverland Valley Ranch phones, what's the spread on those?

A. 1751 to 1918 hours.

Q. Of the five calls between the Marc Schaffel phone and the Vincent Amen phone, can you tell us how many were initiated by either phones?

A. Four calls were initiated by the Vincent Amen telephone number, and one by the Marc Schaffel 8463

1 phone.
2 Q. Okay. Now we can go on to Exhibit 881,
3 please. That's 3-11.
4 A. Okay.
5 Q. Can you explain this exhibit for the jury,
6 please?
7 A. This exhibit shows the telephone of Frank
8 Cascio and Neverland Valley Ranch. There's a total
9 of 11 calls. Neverland Valley Ranch phone and
10 Tavasci, Evelyn/MJJ Productions, there's four
11 telephone calls. Tavasci, Evelyn/ MJJ Production to
12 Tavasci, Evvy, home, second line, one call.
13 Neverland Valley Ranch to Vincent Amen telephones,
14 one call. Ventura David, Janet Arvizo's parents,
15 and Vincent Amen telephone, there's two calls.
16 Schaffel, Marc/Neverland Valley Entertainment and
17 Vincent Amen, there's two calls. Rudy Provencio and
18 Vincent Amen, there's one call. And Jay Jackson and
19 Vincent Amen, three calls.
20 Q. Beginning with the calls between the Jay
21 Jackson phone and the Vince Amen phone, can you tell
22 us what time they began?
23 A. 7:04 in the morning.
24 Q. And were those calls placed by the Amen end?
25 A. Two calls by the Amen end, and one call by
26 Jackson.
27 Q. What time was the call from the Jackson
28 side? 8464

A. 1503, which is 3:03 in the afternoon.
Q. Okay. What about the calls between the Vince Amen phone and the David Ventura phone?
A. Two calls, one at 12:07, and the other at 12:29.
Q. The call at 12:07, which end was the Amen end?
A. The front end. The initiating pend.
Q. Okay. And how long did that phone call last?
A. 22 minutes.
Q. At 12:29, was there another call placed from the Amen phone to the Ventura phone?
A. Yes.
Q. How long did that call last?
A. Five minutes.
Q. With respect to the call between Amen and Provencio, can you tell us what time that call was placed and which end initiated it?
A. The time of the call was at 1710, which is 5:10 in the afternoon, and it was initiated by Vincent Amen phone.
Q. Okay. If you could proceed, please, to Exhibit No. 882, I believe. Is 882 the chart for March 12th of 2003?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell us what's occurring in this exhibit, please? 8465

A. It shows Jay Jackson's phone, or calling --
or calls between a Jay Jackson phone and Neverland
Valley Ranch. There's a total of six calls. A
Neverland Valley Ranch to Tavasci, Evelyn/MJJ
Productions. There's one call. Tavasci, Evelyn/MJJ
Productions to Christopher D. Carter, there's seven
total calls.
Neverland Valley Ranch to Frank Cascio, a
total of 13 calls. Frank Cascio's phone to Vincent
Amen's phone, a total of four calls. Vincent Amen
to Marc Schaffel, four calls.
And Schaffel to Rudy Provencio, two calls.
And Schaffel, Marc, to Christian Robinson or Site
LLC, K. Robinson, one call. And Tavasci, Evelyn/
MJJ Productions to David Ventura, Janet Arvizo's
parents, one call.
Q. With respect to the phone calls -- with
respect to the phone calls initiated between the Jay
Jackson phone and the Neverland Valley Ranch phone,
can you tell us which direction they were going in?
A. All six calls were initiated by Jay Jackson
to Neverland Valley Ranch.
Q. And the calls from Jay Jackson's phone began
at approximately 7:35 in the morning?
A. Yes.
Q. What about the calls between the Frank
Cascio phone and Neverland Valley Ranch, what time
did those begin, please? 8466

A. 1302.
Q. In the afternoon?
A. Correct. 1:02 in the afternoon.
Q. And the calls between the Rudy Provencio phone and the Marc Schaffel phones, were both of those calls from Mr. Provencio's phone to Mr. Schaffel's phone?
A. Yes.
Q. And how long were those calls and at what times?
A. The first call was for 12 minutes. The second call for 20 minutes. The first call was at 1904, which is 7:04 in the evening. The second call was at 2154, which is 9:54 in the evening.
MR. NICOLA: Thank you, Detective Zelis.
THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
MR. NICOLA: Your Honor, I have no further questions.
THE COURT: Cross-examine?

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. SANGER:
Q. Detective, Zelis, how are you doing?
A. Good afternoon.
Q. I'd like to go to Exhibit 870, so I'm going to ask you to take that out of the book, if you would.
And may I approach, Your Honor? 8467

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. SANGER: May I put this on the screen?
THE COURT: Yes.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: Okay. That's Exhibit 870 up on the screen. Now, you are one of the lead investigators in this case; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And based on your investigation in this case, the day of the 19th of February, 2003, was the day that Hamid Moslehi was attempting to put together a video of the Arvizos; is that right?
A. He among others, yes.
Q. Okay. He was the videographer, right?
A. Correct.
Q. And he had a crew, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you understand that that was originally scheduled to take place at Neverland Ranch, correct?
MR. NICOLA: Objection; lack of foundation.
THE COURT: Overruled.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: Sir?
A. That is my understanding, yes.
Q. And then at some point they decided that they had to do it in the Los Angeles area; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's because Janet Arvizo was down there and wanted to do it down there, correct? 8468

MR. NICOLA: Objection. Calls for hearsay and speculation. It's beyond the scope of direct.
THE COURT: Calls for hearsay; sustained.
MR. SANGER: All right.
Q. So you see that there is a good deal of activity between Frank Cascio's phone and the Neverland Valley Ranch phone; is that correct?
A. On this particular date?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes. 13.
Q. And Frank Cascio's phone and Vincent Amen seem to be interacting with each other, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And somebody at Jay Jackson's number is talking with somebody at Vincent Amen's number?
A. Correct.
Q. And also Frank Cascio's number, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And then Mr. Moslehi receives some phone calls, I believe. Does he receive them or make them?
A. He received them.
Q. All right. Now, you were aware that Mr. Moslehi was also at the ranch during that afternoon, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So if he was making phone calls, he could have made phone calls from the Neverland Valley 8469

Ranch telephones; is that correct?
A. I don't know.
Q. All right. He was at the ranch, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you see there's some phone calls that are made from various ranch numbers; is that correct?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Okay. All of the phone calls are made to the ranch numbers; is that your understanding?
A. There are five calls from Neverland Valley Ranch to Frank Cascio.
Q. Okay. That was my original question. So some of the calls are made to Mr. Cascio's phone, and you don't know who made those? They just came from Neverland Valley, correct?
A. Yes.
MR. SANGER: All right. Now, I think I can finish with this witness if I have another 45 seconds.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
Q. BY MR. SANGER: All right. At this time, on February the 19th, you understood that Rudy Provencio was working with Christian Robinson; is that correct?
MR. NICOLA: Objection, assumes facts not in evidence, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Sustained. 8470

Q. BY MR. SANGER: Let's put it this way:
Your understanding from your investigation is that both Christian Robinson and Rudy Provencio were associated with Mr. Schaffel; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And as far as the production was concerned, they were working on the production on behalf of Mr. Schaffel, the production of the rebuttal video; is that correct?
MR. NICOLA: Objection. Vague; assumes facts not in evidence.
THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. SANGER: Okay. I have no further questions.
THE COURT: All right. We'll take our afternoon recess. I'll see you tomorrow morning.
MR. NICOLA: Your Honor -- may the witness be excused? I won't have any redirect.
THE COURT: No redirect?
You may step down.
Call your next witness first thing in the morning.
MR. NICOLA: Thank you.
(The proceedings adjourned at 2:30 p.m.)
--o0o--

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE)
OF CALIFORNIA,)
Plaintiff,)
-vs-) No. 1133603
MICHAEL JOE JACKSON,)
Defendant.)

I, MICHELE MATTSON McNEIL, RPR, CRR, CSR #3304, Official Court Reporter, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing pages 8356 through 8471 contain a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the within and above-entitled matter as by me taken down in shorthand writing at said proceedings on May 2, 2005, and thereafter reduced to typewriting by computer-aided transcription under my direction.

DATED: Santa Maria, California, May 2, 2005.